



Fountains Abbey.

ENGLISH CHURCH ARCHITECTURE IN ITS RELATION TO ENGLISH HISTORY.

By the Reverend H. C. WINDLEY, M.A.,

VICAR OF ST. CHAD'S, BENSHAM, GATESHEAD-ON-TYNE.

Read before the Northern Architectural Association at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 6th December 1904.

"FOR REALLY GREAT ART IDEAS COMMON TO THE NATION ARE ESSENTIAL."

J. A. SYMONDS, *The Renaissance in Italy*, vol. iii. 353.

SINCE undertaking to read a Paper to your Association on the subject of "English Church Architecture in its relation to English History" I have happened in my reading to come across these words of one of our great modern art critics. I have ventured to take them as a sort of motto for my Paper, because they seem to express a truth which I think many architects do not sufficiently realise. Great art in any branch, whether of the fine arts or the applied arts, must inevitably be the result of inspiration, and not merely of fashion, or schools, or the copying of styles, or even of the State organisation of such a profession as yours, and still less of systems of examination. National art in the twentieth century will be in its merits as well as its demerits a reflection of national ideals, and these ideals will be largely influenced by our knowledge and appreciation of our national history. We must not go to the past, however, as a species of mine from which we may dig ideas as they suit us, to be reproduced in our modern work. This has undoubtedly been, and is still to a great degree, a danger in your profession. But we need to study the architecture of bygone days,

always in relation to the general history of its day, to see the sources and goals of its development as they are revealed in the ideas and aspirations of its authors. Architecture is one most important volume in the great unwritten library of history, but if it is to be studied effectively it must, like every branch of history, be studied scientifically and in the spirit of history.

The study of English church architecture leads us back into a period of which there is little or no documentary survival, while the evidence of its remains is only traceable with great difficulty and with much specialisation.

English architecture has from the earliest beginning been deeply affected by foreign influences. So much is this the case that in a certain sense it would be correct to say that we have no purely English architecture; and this paradox points to one important characteristic of the English nation, viz. its marvellous power of assimilation, of absorbing not only the "ideas" of other nations, but even of absorbing other nations themselves and of welding them, even when they appeared to us as conquerors, into the unity of our national life.

The historical student of architecture will be so far impressed with this fact that he will very soon be forced to recognise that if he is to understand the architecture of this little island he will be obliged to begin his travels beyond the seas.

Consider for one moment some of the chief influences which we can discover at work in the development of our English architecture, and at once we shall grasp the width of the subject, the immensity of ground which we shall have to study. Celtic, Roman (Imperial), Romanesque, Lombardic-Romanesque, Scandinavian, Oriental, French influences, and later the great upheaval of the Renaissance: all these have passed and left their mark, while outside the width of geographical and ethnical study which they suggest there are also the ecclesiastical, theological, and, above all, the economic influences at home and abroad of which we must take account.

The fact is, the Anglo-Saxon conquerors of Britain have given us our national name and a good many of our national characteristics; but they did not, so far as I can see, *ever originate in design*; they assimilated the ideas of other men, they modified but they did not produce any original architecture, simply because they had none.

The heathen Anglian and Saxon invaders landed in this island, and they found here, what they had in all probability never seen before, stone buildings, fortified towns (falling, it is true, into ruins), and they found churches; they found the broken fragments of the Imperial Roman civilisation continued, when the strong Roman arm had been withdrawn, by the Romano-Celtic civilisation of the half-Romanised but feebly decadent descendants of the ancient Celts or Britons.

Probably nothing in the new-found home of our heathen ancestors appealed to them less than the value or importance of these buildings. They for the most part completed the destruction of the towns and have left us but the barest remnants of their walls or churches. Whilst we cannot underestimate the antiquarian interest of the few remains they left us, we are forced to recognise that the study of Romano-Celtic architecture is of no direct value to us in tracing the sources of English church architecture. It was not until long after their first appearance that our Anglo-Saxon ancestors became Christian, and until the conversion of England was well begun they obviously had no need of church buildings.

The old Christian inhabitants of the land were forced into the wilder parts of the west, and we can well believe that such architectural skill as was left to them was rapidly deteriorated or entirely lost in the precarious life which they were forced to lead.

The first of the new English kingdoms to feel the need of church architecture was Kent, which through a royal marriage had already welcomed a Christian queen before the landing

of the first missionaries in 597, and under her influence her Frankish clergy had been able to restore the ruins of one of the old Roman fabrics, that of St. Martin at Canterbury. St. Augustine and his followers proceeded, with the King's permission, to restore other ancient ruins surviving from the Roman occupation, and such churches as they built appear to have always been basilican in plan, with the usual round apsidal termination.

Meanwhile, in the north, St. Columba had landed in Iona, and from this source we find a different architectural and ecclesiastical tradition advancing to meet the Continental mission of St. Augustine. The Kentish mission made little progress. Paulinus, indeed, was able to penetrate to Northumbria; but his mission, though most important in its indirect results, was forced to retire, and the northern kingdom relapsed almost entirely into paganism until about the year 635, when St. Aidan arrived at the invitation of King Oswald.

The influence of Aidan's Celtic mission was, architecturally as well as religiously, of the most far-reaching importance.

The Irish-Celtic Church was the home of great artistic activity as well as of great missionary fervour, and both of these qualities have left indelible marks on the history of our English Christianity. The missionary activity—and with it the architectural activity—of the Italian mission in Kent remained almost entirely confined to South-eastern England. But the influence of the Celtic mission through Iona and Lindisfarne comparatively rapidly overspread the north and the Midlands, and penetrated to many parts of the East Anglian and East Saxon kingdoms, and through Wilfrid reached the most southern borders of Wessex. The plan of the Celtic churches was always rectangular, with the square-ended chancel, unlike the Roman apsidal plan; and it is perhaps the most singular fact in architectural history that throughout the development of English church architecture this square-ended chancel of the Celtic church should have again and again persisted, and through every introduction of the Continental apse should have remained to this day the most distinguishing feature of English churches.

The period of the conversion of England may be roughly said to have extended from the landing of Augustine in 597 to the accession of Theodore of Tarsus to the throne of Canterbury in 669. It was under the rule of Theodore that the isolated national churches of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were first welded into a homogeneous whole, while it was not until the accession of King Egbert in 827 that our ancestors emerged into any kind of national life. This period of about 150 years was the best and happiest age in the existence of the Anglo-Saxon Church, for very shortly the land was again to be overrun by the pagan Danes or Norsemen of Scandinavia.

But before we pass on to look at the later post-Danish Saxon buildings we must briefly consider how far advance had been made before that invasion towards any national ecclesiastical architecture. Præ-Saxon Christianity being Roman in origin, we are not surprised to find one or two remains of Christian churches of the very earliest period which are pure basilicas in plan. The finest examples still remaining, the plans of which are easily recoverable, are Silchester (certainly), while Brixworth (Northamptonshire) and Wing and Lyding should, I think (with all respect for recent authority), be added. But it is important to note that we have the remains of at least one Romano-Celtic church at Perranzabuloe, *circa* 450, which shows the plan of a plain parallelogram without aisles or chancel, such as we have noted to prevail in Ireland and (through the Celtic mission) in later days in the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

Under the influence of the Celtic mission we shall find that this simple parallelogram, as at Perranzabuloe, is modified by the addition of a smaller parallelogram connected with the larger by a narrow chancel arch, and this, with various modifications of porches, becomes

the normal Celto-Saxon plan which we find most perfectly illustrated in such churches as Escombe, in the county of Durham, and Bradford-on-Avon, in Wiltshire.

From the point of view of their plan the more famous churches of Jarrow and Monkwearmouth are of much less value to the architect as evidence. At Monkwearmouth little remains of the original church except the tower and west wall, though there is little doubt that the nave and chancel stand mainly on the original foundations; but even the tower, as regards its upper portion, is almost certainly post-Danish; while at Jarrow the church is in all probability a composite building, two original churches being joined by a late but most interesting post-Danish tower. Nevertheless these churches are indirectly most valuable evidence of the pertinacity of the Celtic traditional plan. Benedic Biscop, we know, took immense pains to cultivate the art of building in Northumbria, and we read how he even brought masons from abroad to build after the Roman (*i.e.* Romanesque) manner; and yet we find the net result as regards plan is utterly unlike anything which he would see in his Continental travels. In order to realise this more fully, it is worth while to pay a visit to Monkwearmouth, and then to go straight to St. Columba's, Southwick, where you will see a most excellent modern basilica of just the type which Benedic would see in its perfection during his visits to Italy. We must, however, remember that in this case it is not all contrast; if the plan of Monkwearmouth is Celtic, the execution and type of masonry are indeed foreign, and we may reasonably look on Benedic and his great building successor, Wilfrid, as the true fathers of English masonry, a masonry inspired by Italian models.

With the consolidation of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms under Egbert we complete one stage or period, and with the ninth-century incursions of the Danes we open a second stage in the consideration of our subject. The Danish invasions continued over a long space of time, but the climax of their most destructive period is well marked by the martyrdom of St. Edmund on 20th November 870. The English buildings all along the eastern coasts and well up the courses of the rivers had been steadily pillaged and burnt. In 879, however, Alfred the Great compelled the invaders to treat, and they agreed to accept Christianity; but while they were thus led to live near or amongst the English people, it must be borne in mind that for that very reason the English became modified in blood; the Danes intermarried with the English to a great extent, but for centuries the two did not become wholly welded into one people, and even now it is probable that many of us in this room are far more purely Scandinavians in descent than we are English, though we pride ourselves on the name!

The Danish invasions did not cease; the successors of Alfred were only able to check and not to suppress them, and a hundred years later we find Dunstan, the great statesman-archbishop, deposing (952) Wulfstan, the Danish Archbishop of York, in order to gain a necessary influence over the northern clergy. The effect of Dunstan's splendid administration was for the moment undone by the last of the Danish invasions (990-1017), and again the English Church yielded a saintly martyr in the person of St. Elphege.

This long period of apparently disastrous strife and invasion ended in an enormous gain for our national life in the consolidation of the kingdom under Cnut, the first undisputed King of all England.

The Scandinavian invaders, like their Anglo-Saxon predecessors, had no knowledge of stone construction. The constant strain of invasion and the disorganisation in Church and State told so heavily on the Church that the monasteries, the home of the arts, were almost entirely emptied, and in many cases stood in ruins and were entirely deserted by their inmates. Evidence of this is always before us in the north in the memory of the wanderings of the monks of Lindisfarne carrying the relics of St. Cuthbert and St. Oswald—wanderings

which were fraught with great consequences in the final settlement of the much-tried brethren in their new home upon the Wear, with its glorious buildings of a later date.

During the hundred years of comparative peace which followed the Treaty of Wedmore great efforts were made by Alfred and his successors to recover some measure of the prosperity and learning of the Church. These efforts were constantly interrupted by internal disputes, and little seems to have been effected, though much restoration of ruined buildings was carried out. So far as this restoration work can be traced it shows marked deterioration in style, in execution, and in construction. From this period I date what used to be considered a characteristic of Saxon work, viz. "long and short" work, coupled with the imitation timber construction so well shown in the Towers of Sompting (Essex) and Earl's Barton (Northants).

These marks of what I shall call the post-Danish period are, I believe, the result of the loss of constructive skill occasioned by the destruction of the monastic art schools and the dispersion of their skilled inmates by the heathen invaders, and such loss of skill could not fully be supplied by the Norse conquerors even when they became Christian. To them wood construction was the only form of building known. That they should have attempted to transfer their ideas of wood construction to their earlier attempts at stone work is not surprising; and the single remaining wooden church at Greenstead (Essex) only points to what was probably the most general method of supplying the architectural needs of the time, in accordance with the ability of the ruling class. What I consider to be a perfectly clear example of post-Danish restoration of an earlier but ruined monastic church occurs at Repton (Derbyshire), where, I maintain, you will see a peculiarly fine early Anglo-Saxon (strictly Mercian) crypt modelled on Continental ideas as regards detail, but rectangular, with most excellent work in columns and vaulting, similar in many respects to the little eastern chapel in the cloisters of San Zeno at Verona, while the Saxon superstructure with traces of wood construction strips is the rude post-Danish restoration of the upper church.

The conquest and consolidation of the kingdom by the Danes thus concludes our second stage in our subject, and again we mark the assimilative power of the English race. The Danish conquerors were soon absorbed in the older nationality.

Our third period I shall take from the accession of Edward the Confessor (1042) to that of the accession of the Angevin line begun by Henry II. in 1154. This is again another period of conquest and of absorption. During this period the relations of the English Church with the Continental Churches became rapidly more intimate; the journeys of ecclesiastics and their increasing learning spread the knowledge of the arts as they had not been spread since the time of the early Celtic missions. Once more we find that the improvements in the art of building are foreign in their origin, and the movement is led by the half-Norman King Edward. To such an audience as this it is probably unnecessary that I should point out that the so-called Norman architecture is not any more Norman than English; the Normans themselves were closely akin to, and little more advanced in civilisation than, the Norsemen who had recently conquered England. Just as with the English Church, so with the Norman. In Normandy the Church was undergoing a great revival, chiefly owing to the labours of the great Italian scholars like Lanfranc and Anselm. It was this revival of religious fervour aroused by them that partly found its outlet in enormous building activity—an activity which both on its religious and artistic side was already telling almost contemporaneously on England even before the Conquest, and which so far as we can see would inevitably have worked its course, though more slowly, if that Conquest had never taken place.

What, however, would have been a work of time, was by the Conquest effected almost at a blow. The English clergy were insular, and were slow to accept the new teaching; but the Conqueror when he took over the government at once removed the majority of their leaders

who were disaffected and placed Italians or Italianised Normans in their places. The result was that while the majority of the parochial clergy and monks remained the same in *personnel*, they were immensely stimulated by the infusion of new life from without.

Architecturally the result is of course well known. Church after church was restored or replaced within a very few years comparatively, and in every case we find they took the ordinary Italian style of the period, that Romanesque which had been gradually winning its way through all the Continental countries, and which had already begun to be ushered into England by the influence of the Confessor even before the Normans were thought of as our conquerors.

The Normans, though they had learnt the new style, had not learnt to deal satisfactorily with its structural difficulties. The new basilicas were structurally inferior to the earlier Saxon work, and a great number had to be rebuilt within a very short period of their erection. The plans of very many of these churches are still easily accessible beneath the later buildings, as at Durham, or stand out in almost perfect preservation, as at Norwich. These plans were invariably apsidal, one or more apses forming the eastern termination of chancels, aisles, and chapels.

We are thus once more face to face with the remarkable fact which I have already mentioned, viz. that of the persistence of the Celtic tradition of the square termination; the new Norman, or more correctly Romanesque plan, almost as soon as it becomes dominant gives way to the old tradition. Church after church, cathedral after cathedral, must be rebuilt, foundations fail or towers fall; and in every case the new buildings spring up, as at Durham so also throughout the land, rectangular and not apsidal. For one Norman church which has survived with its apse, it would be easy to quote dozens where in reconstruction the apse has given way to the rectangle. Here in the north we have a parish church at Warwick, near Carlisle, which has remained unchanged, to remind us of the multitudes of similar little churches which experienced the fate of the great church at Durham.

And just as in architecture the English clergy absorbed and converted in their own way the architecture of the Continent, so it was with regard to the foreign ecclesiastics and the foreign nobles. Towards the close of our third period, the native and foreign elements are rapidly coalescing: we begin to discover a united English nation which is once again conquering its conquerors by this quiet method of assimilation.

I have said that in considering this period, which for convenience we call the Norman period, we must look primarily to Italy for the influence of the prevailing Romanesque style working northward through Normandy to England. At the same time our English as well as the Norman architecture across the Channel was being materially modified from Oriental sources, and this in two ways: first through the Crusades, and secondly through the conquest of Apulia and Sicily by the Normans.

The first Crusade falls within our third period, beginning in 1096, while the invasion of Apulia began as early as 995 and culminated in Roger's Kingdom of Sicily, beginning in 1130 and continuing under his successors until 1266. Through both of these channels the Franco-Normans and in a less degree the Anglo-Normans were brought into direct contact with Saracenic architecture. If Italian ecclesiastics were seated on English thrones, Englishmen might be consoled to know that two at least of the Sicilian bishops were natives of England.

The origin of the pointed arch has been most pertinaciously pursued by architects and archaeologists, and it has been most variously accounted for. The most reasonable of these explanations has been that it arose out of the constructive requirements of vaulting; but what could be more reasonable than that the Christian builders of Europe learnt the possibilities of

such pointed vaulting from the existing Moslem works of the East and South? In Sicily, at least, you see Norman and Saracen meet on a common ground, while Saracen workmen build under Norman masters. Whilst such a suggestion may be unprovable, I cannot but think that the relations between the Normans and Anglo-Normans and the Mediterranean must have had some effect on the development of our architecture, and I believe that there remains an important field for the study of this subject, in Sicily particularly, but also in other parts of the Mediterranean littoral, where students may compare the wonderful Norman buildings of the south, with their Byzantine, Oriental, and Classical decorations, with the great buildings which we find to-day in Normandy and England.

The transition from what is usually called Norman to the early pointed style is extremely gradual. By 1150 the pointed arch was in widely accepted use, but instances occur much earlier in the century. No line can in fact be arbitrarily drawn between any styles of architecture any more than between any stages in any sort of organic growth. As a matter of fact, the whole of my third period (1042-1154) was in reality a transitional period, a period during which the Normano-Saxon people of Northern Europe were assimilating and transforming the treasures of southern civilisation and art, whether coming from the Romanesque of Northern Italy or the more distant shores of the Mediterranean. It is from this period first that architecture develops on truly independent lines according to locality. From this time (1154) onwards we may begin to trace the development of true English Gothic architecture as distinct from the Gothic of France, the Empire, or of Italy. It would be superfluous for me to attempt to enter into any detailed discussion of the recognised styles which English building passed through in this development; you as members of the profession know your text-books. What I want to do in as short a compass as possible is to suggest that in spite of the convenience of dividing our mediæval architecture into "styles," it would be more scientific to consider the so-called styles of Early English, Decorated, and Perpendicular architecture as merely structural and decorative modifications which our forefathers evolved from the transitional Norman period.

I take as my fourth division of time the period from Henry II. (1154) to Henry VII. (1485). During this period of 330 years there were no great upheavals such as we have considered in the past, nor such as we must consider later as arising in the Renaissance, but all through the period the activity of the architectural world was related to the intellectual and economic conditions of society. The development of the monastic orders, for instance, the growth of the Cistercians from the twelfth century onwards until they became the great wool growers and exporters, perhaps the wealthiest single body of men in the community; the coming of the Friars; the growth of boroughs, with their corporate government and guilds of all sorts which were great patrons of building; the universities—all these and a thousand other changes in our national life, Continental conquests, French dominions, repeated Crusades with their crusading orders of Templars and Knights of St. John, contributed to call for fresh buildings, fresh developments of style and ornament, while the means for such costly building activity were by no means always easily raised, and at one time, following on such an awful disaster as the Black Death, must for the time being almost have ceased. The fact is, the life of the so-called "dark ages" had been "focussed in religion and stamped in the undying memorials of stone construction," as Bishop Lightfoot has said in his *Historical Essays*, and we cannot rightly study our architecture without opening our histories—the written book and the stone book here meet to throw a necessary light the one upon the other.

And the leaders in all this wonderful life were still often "foreigners." Simon de Montfort, the "father" of the English Parliament, that proudest possession of our national history, was a Frenchman born, and again and again the same note of assimilative power in English nationality

is struck, and all through these wonderful years, in spite of foreigners, in spite of constant travel, an English architecture is evolved, and yet an English architecture, singularly enough, which finds its most distinguishing mark in that peculiar persistence of the Celtic square-ended chancel, which we have marked from the earliest days, as compared with which nothing similar can be found in the architecture of any country in Europe. And, lastly, before we pass from the hasty view of this period, we must mark the final evolution of our peculiarly English style. As the national life becomes more and more marked, as the national language becomes more articulate, as our relations with France become less frequent and close, we finally produce the wonderful buildings which we call "Perpendicular" in style, but which might be called in the truest possible sense "English," and English only. You have not long ago had the benefit of a most admirable Paper from one of your leading members on the subject of this fifteenth-century architecture, and I could not if I would deal with it in any detail, but I hope that the Paper you had from Mr. Wood* will not have been in vain in directing more and more attention to the most English architecture which we possess.

I must now pass to my fifth or modern period. The end of the fifteenth century was marked by one of the greatest upheavals in the history of Europe. The fall of Constantinople, the opening out of the "new learning," the discovery of America, and the invention of printing mark a crisis in our history which is reflected in our architecture.

With the invention of printing the stone book of church architecture gave place to the torrents of literature which almost overwhelmed the Church in the sixteenth century. Church architecture became almost a lost art, not only here, but throughout Christendom, although there was intense architectural activity as regards domestic buildings. The wealth of the Middle Ages centred to a very great extent in the Church, and especially in the monastic orders: nobles were too busy in making war, the new order of burghers were too busy in securing the rights and privileges of trade; but now with the new life of the Renaissance wealth was not only shifted from one body in the community to another, but was enormously increased. Facilities of commerce and security of trade steadily improved, while in an incredibly short time the treasure of new continents began to pour into Europe, changing the economic conditions of the age and enormously raising the standard of living. The Church of the Middle Ages had been indeed the home, the town hall, the public offices, even the theatre of mediæval life; but now the decorations, the rich stuffs, the colouring which had been lavished on God's house were in turn lavished in even more prodigal profusion on the new palaces of the nobility and burgher princes.

The Jacobean age brought with it a revival of devotional life which found an outlet in great works of much-needed restoration; but with the exception of Wren's great masterpiece and its attendant satellites in the area destroyed by the Great Fire, and the completion of St. Peter's at Rome, I know of no really great church building throughout the length and breadth of Christian Europe. The Jacobean revival of architecture, which was to a great extent an echo of the late fifteenth century as regards its style, gave place to the depraved materialism and neo-classicism of the eighteenth century, which swept not only over England but over Europe, with its wave of whitewash and obscenity in every land.

In England, after the restoration of Charles II., Gothic architecture could hardly be tolerated. The refined Evelyn denounces "a certain fantastical and licentious manner of building, which we have since called modern or Gothic," and denounces those "dull, heavy, monkish piles, without any just proportion, use, or beauty," while the great architectural genius of the age, when consulted on the restoration of St. Paul's after the Fire, expressed his wish to

* "English Architecture of the Fifteenth Century." By W. H. Wood. (JOURNAL R.I.B.A., 27th August 1904).

replace "the Gothic rudeness of the old design" by a new erection "after a good Roman manner." Wren himself did indeed make an occasional effort at continuing "Gothic rudeness," and you will remember the western towers of Westminster as an example of the very slight appreciation of the style which he possessed. Wren's grandson, at a much later date, gives further expression to his ancestor's views on Gothic architecture when he says: "They soon began to debauch this noble and useful art . . . they set up those slender and misshapen pillars, or rather bundles of staves and incongruous props, to support incumbent weights and ponderous arched roofs without entablature; and though not without industry, nor altogether naked of gaudy sculpture, 'tis such as gluts the eye rather than gratifies or pleases it with any reasonable satisfaction."

But, after all, the "reasonable satisfaction" induced by the existence of a blessed "entablature" which was produced by Wren and the seventeenth-century masters was a very much higher satisfaction than that which satisfied our eighteenth-century ancestors.

Again, in the eighteenth century, not only in England, but all through Europe, the low standard of spiritual life runs side by side with the utilitarianism of the age in producing the most hideous architectural abortions as regards ecclesiastical building which the world has ever seen. Jesuit architecture in the south vied with churchwarden architecture in the north in destroying vast areas of gorgeous wall paintings and frescoes, and defacing woodwork and stonework alike. We in the north have only to go to Durham to realise the immensity of the damage when we think of the chapter-house wilfully destroyed to make a stuffy meeting-room for idle and fat bewigged canons; when we remember that the Galilee Chapel was only saved by one vote from a like destruction in order to make a convenient drive to the dean's kitchen, and the whole of the time-worn exterior of the church was solemnly chipped of two inches of its surface to make it neat and abolish the marks which the venerable hand of Time had laid upon it. In all the destruction wrought by fanaticism under Edward VI. or Cromwell, it is probable that nothing was done approaching the irreparable damage of the eighteenth century. The freedom of the Renaissance had at last found its true fetters in the slavery of a licentious atheism which pervaded everyone in society, in politics, in religion, beside which the later days of Imperial Rome can alone be placed in comparison. The devotion of the few did indeed keep alight the lamp of faith, and with it memories of a more glorious past; but it needed the touch of revolution and the bitter cry of down-trodden toilers at home and abroad to force the glimmering spark into a flame.

The ideals of the French Revolution, the movements of the industrial revolution in England at the end of the eighteenth century, the conception of the brotherhood of man, were needed if great ideas were once more to inspire any great art.

At the close of the eighteenth century we enter another period when men are beginning, though feebly, to feel the inadequacy of the purely material measure afforded by wealth. With new yearnings and under new economic conditions art and architecture begin once more to claim their place in the fulfilment of the various offices of national life.

Architecture in the nineteenth century will lend its witness to the turmoil and caprice of an age of unsettlement; it will lend its witness at once to the most vulgar materialism and the most passionate devotion. During the century the whole view of life has been undergoing a change which I venture to believe will become more and more recognised. The social instinct is gradually becoming sanctified in the realisation of the Incarnation, and men are coming to understand that each in his separate sphere has a function to perform, a life to contribute, a work to do for the glory of God and in the name of the Crucified. And this feeling ramifies through all branches of national life, not always recognised, but still none the less surely present, men realising that not in religion alone in its old conception, but in every

walk of life the service of God and our fellows is foremost. Archbishop Benson boldly stated this truth when he said "there is nothing secular but that which is sinful," and the more clearly such a view is held, the more it permeates society, the more shall we find an ideal which will not only in church architecture but in all the arts produce great work.

And as regards church architecture—for this is my subject—it *must* be the outcome of Church life and Church feeling. It is just so far as the Church realises its national—nay, rather its international—responsibilities, so far as the Church leads the people to realise their sanctification and unity in "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all"; it is just so far as she does this that she will inspire a worthy architecture.

In the Middle Ages the Church included the nation; now the nation includes many religious societies; and I believe that, so far as they are living, they will each require some differences of architecture parallel to the diversity of their religious life. But we must remember that in modern history, as in earlier days, architecture has been materially affected by economic conditions: the separation of trades and division of labour have forced the architect into becoming too often a mere designer, the builder into a mere organiser of labour. With the loss of craftsmanship runs, too, the loss of self-dedication and of a man's interest in his labour. It is not easy to feel the corporate spirit and interest in the work of others of a different trade, but it is this very spirit which those who have felt the benefit of a more cultured life and surroundings are bound to strive to bring to others. There is no reason why we should not learn to rejoice each in another's work; no reason why the mason should not rejoice in the beauty of the painter's work, or the painter in co-operating with the glass-worker; but until some spirit of unity is introduced in our daily life we cannot really ever again produce architecture of the greatest type on any national scale.

And before I close let me add one or two other words about our present church architecture. I am speaking to architects and not to clergy, but you can do something better than make plans if in your church work and church decorations you will set before us clergy the ideal of dedicating only the *best* and not the *most* to God's service. We clergy need to be reminded that we have a moral and spiritual obligation to "cut our coats" according to a small quantity of very good cloth, instead of a large quantity of poor material. If it is true that we write our history in the stones of our buildings, then it is necessary in these days of jerry-building for the Church to hold up a standard of labour and devotion amidst the squalid streets of our cities, which shall mark her to posterity as in advance of and not behind the times.

Let every art, according to our opportunity and means, contribute its share to the glorious whole. In former days the mason did not sit down and consider his mouldings complete until they were adorned and brought out into effective play by the skill of the decorator, nor was oak so precious but that in certain places it was thought suitable to glorify it by every skill of the artist. The needleworker and the jeweller, the silversmith and the blacksmith, the sculptor and the painter, all brought their offerings into the holy place, and no gift of genius nor diversity of trade but in some way felt the unity of the same spirit.

I have already taken more of your time than I have any right to do, but I hope that in what I have said I may have succeeded in some measure in reaching my goal—viz. rather to be "suggestive" than "instructive," rather to raise questionings than to answer them. I have sought to show that in our architecture history has stamped itself in an exceptional degree; and as we realise this we shall have added interest in our study of the present with its problems and difficulties, for we shall realise that we also are "making" history, and not only buildings for the use of this generation.



9, CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W., 14th Jan. 1905.

CHRONICLE.

ARCHITECTURE AND BUILDING REGULATIONS.

ADJOURNED DISCUSSION.

At the General Meeting of the 9th inst., the ordinary business concluded, discussion was resumed of the Papers read on the 19th prox.—viz. "Building By-laws, specially in Rural Districts," by Mr. Lacy W. Ridge [*F.*] and "Architectural Design and the London Building Act," by Mr. James S. Gibson [*F.*].*

THE PRESIDENT, in opening the discussion, said that the Papers were quite distinct, and should be discussed separately. They would consider Mr. Ridge's proposals first and exhaust the subject before proceeding to Mr. Gibson's.

Building By-laws, specially in Rural Districts.

Mr. Lacy Ridge, continued the President, had given them a new and simple code which, so far as he could see, appeared to give the maximum of freedom with the minimum of restraint. He had dealt with matters that concerned the community at large, such as the frontage of every building from the centre of the road rather than from the adjoining premises; and with such matters as the disposal of sewage, and other sanitary questions connected with the inhabitants in particular. He hoped they should have some practical suggestions, so that the Council might be able to deal with the matter effectively; and if Mr. Ridge had anything further to say in elucidation of the subject, he was sure they would be glad to hear him.

MR. LACY W. RIDGE [*F.*] said he ventured, rather with the view of preventing the discussion becoming an "experience" meeting, to move a proposition. They all knew, and were pretty well agreed, that something must be done, or ought to be done, with regard to these by-laws, which were extremely inconvenient to those who had to build

in the country. The great thing was to find a remedy. The remedy he had suggested in his Paper was that the Local Government Board should get statutory powers from Parliament in order that they might reform the existing by-laws which at present they could not interfere with; and that the Local Government Board themselves should bring out by-laws, for which they would be responsible, and which could be enforced by the local bodies. It was impossible for an Institute like this or any other body to influence the hundreds of local councils throughout the country: persons who were obscure even in their own locality—persons whom they could not possibly get at and reason with, whereas they could reason with the Local Government Board, the central body in London. He therefore moved the following proposition: "That in the opinion of this meeting it is desirable that the Local Government Board should obtain parliamentary powers to enable it to reform the by-laws now in force in rural districts and in the smaller towns, with a view to the enactment of such by-laws, and such by-laws only, as are really required in the public interest."

MR. EDWIN T. HALL seconded the motion. They were all interested, he said, in Mr. Ridge's Paper and were in entire sympathy with his suggestions. At present the rural by-laws were often suitable for urban districts only; and there was no question that they retarded the building of cottages, which was a big political question, because it was concerned with the retention of the rural population on the land. If this population could not be housed, how could they possibly stop there? They could not be housed on any commercial lines if they had to be provided with houses costing, say, £30 a year when they could only afford to pay £10. Therefore it was felt that the Government would listen with respect to views sent from the Institute when their object was to facilitate the erection of cottages to house rural labourers. Broadly, that was a principle with which he thought the Legislature must also sympathise. They in the Institute were all desirous that buildings should be sound and good, and, if they could afford it, of the best; but if people could not afford to live in a palace they must live in a hut. Mr. Ridge had suggested that the Local Government Board at present had no power of rescinding an approval already given. He was afraid that was so; but if they saw their way to adopt the resolution proposed, it would enable them to recast the whole scheme, and to look at it from a broader point of view. With regard to the detailed suggestions Mr. Ridge had made, there were one or two things which perhaps would need a little amplifying, or at all events some little varying. For example, they did not want to deal with the local authority as though it were a hostile authority; and, though

* JOURNAL R.I.B.A. 24th Dec. 1904.

they did not want to have to put their clients to the expense of supplying elaborate plans, he would venture to suggest to Mr. Ridge that when he was drafting his document he might meet the reasonable view of the local authority; and though they ought not to have to supply drawings of buildings, he thought it would be perfectly reasonable for them to submit a block plan showing where the building was to be erected. It would not put the architect to much trouble, and it would give the local authority a reasonable amount of information—if it were only to enable them to plot the site of the building on their local plans, so that they might have a record of the buildings that were going to be produced. Mr. Ridge, he thought, had made a slight mistake in suggesting that cottages should be dealt with in the same way as factories and assembly halls in rural districts. A factory must be subject to the special laws dealing with factories and the workers therein, because it was perfectly conceivable that in a village otherwise rural a large factory might be erected where 1,200, 1,400, or even 2,000 people might be employed. It was the practice now for many manufacturers to go into rural places and put up factories there. He thought, therefore, that they ought not to deal with the local authority in respect to factories and assembly halls as they should deal with them in respect of cottages for the working classes. They came under a different category. A factory should be amenable to all the laws which were necessary for the protection of operatives, and therefore owners should give more information in their case. The same remark applied, in a different way, to assembly halls. Where an assembly hall was erected, say, to contain 200 or 300 people it was perfectly right that the local authority should have jurisdiction over the exits and fire appliances attached to such buildings; and, therefore, in the case of those buildings it would be reasonable and desirable that a plan should be supplied showing such—in outline if they pleased, but showing how the exits were provided, and how the fire appliances were to be applied. With reference to Mr. Ridge's suggestion (B), that no building should be built within 20 feet of the centre of the road except porches or other projections, he thought the exceptions would be a mistake. It was perfectly reasonable that there should be for the public enjoyment a clear space of 40 feet—a road of 40 feet—and that there should be no porches or anything else projecting in front of that building-line. It would be following a very admirable precedent. In the Duchy of Lancaster Estates and Epping Forest, and in Enfield Chase, for instance, no road, he believed, could be made on those estates less than 40 feet in width. He would suggest that there no building should be permitted in front of the line which the building owner himself had laid down. With reference to the damp-

course, Mr. Ridge said that it should be of slate. A certain class of people would interpret that by-law as the maximum and not the minimum. The jerry-builder might interpret it to mean one course of slate, which would simply mean that between every slate the damp would come up; therefore it would be only reasonable to say that the damp-course should be of two slates broken-jointed. Again, as to the disconnection of pipes, Mr. Ridge said that the sink waste should discharge into the open air before going into the drain. He thought they ought to say "over a trap gully," or the jerry-builder would put nothing of the kind, and they would have the sewer-gas coming up into the air. There were other things which were mere details, but when they were laying down anything like an enactment—and a by-law was akin to an enactment—they had to be accurate in details. They were, however, only the fringe of the subject. The actual broad lines Mr. Ridge had laid down were the sound ones: they gave a reasonable latitude to those who desired to do what was, after all, the aim and object of Mr. Ridge's scheme—viz. to enable cottages to be built. When that was attained, and when these powers had been obtained, they would find that the great difficulty of housing the rural population would be facilitated, and everyone would benefit—the architect, the employer, and the inhabitant, the rural labourer himself.

MR. LACY RIDGE explained that the by-laws he proposed were not put forward as complete in themselves, but as mere indications. He had read them as part of a Paper which he did not wish much to exceed half an hour. Had he read the by-laws with all the little refinements which were thought necessary, he should have kept the meeting a very much longer time, and he had said particularly that they wanted discussion and technical drafting. As regards factories, the Factory Acts were not mixed up with these by-laws, and therefore they would remain in force exactly as they were. With regard to projections, it was not a question that the road was to be made 40 feet wide, but that no one was to come nearer than 20 feet to the centre of the road. The road might only be 15 feet wide, and one could hardly say that a man should not have a covered way up to his house if he set it back 15 feet from the road. It would only be a building to remain so long as the authority did not think proper to make the road 40 feet wide. He had said that the powers as to dangerous buildings should be made to apply to new buildings. That, he thought, would justify the inquiry that Mr. Hall suggested with regard to the exits of a public building of any size, or of a factory. The authorities might fairly ask the man who was putting up such a building to show them the plans. It was the demand for deposited plans that was so objectionable.

Mr. G. BERTRAM BULMER [*F.*], President of the Leeds and Yorkshire Architectural Society, said he should like to say a few words on the subject, as it was one on which he felt deeply interested. He thought he could point to another view of the matter which would no doubt interest Mr. Ridge and Mr. Hall and other members interested in the question. He had had experience of the condition of things where rural by-laws obtained in the immediate proximity to borough by-laws. Now there was a class of the population whose wants and requirements had to be considered: those were the people who must either dwell in the rural districts or in the borough districts, and if any alteration of the rural by-laws could be brought about it would be very advantageous in enabling those boroughs to extend themselves, because it would enable the more or less poor man who could just afford to build a house at the minimum cost to erect outside the borough boundaries a house which would meet all his requirements, and which would not require to be controlled by the borough by-laws because of its more isolated position. It was the fact of country buildings standing within an area where there was plenty of land, and consequently not the same danger of fire, that should permit us to erect buildings of a lighter and less expensive character than those which were necessary within the borough boundaries. If he had made that point clear he thought he should have added one more reason why an amendment and revision of our rural by-laws should be made.

Mr. SYDNEY W. CRANFIELD [*A.*] said he should like to say a word in connection with the question of the desirability of having different codes of by-laws. Mr. Hall's remark as to factories being now frequently built in the country, to which the rural by-laws would not apply, would rather suggest that one code of by-laws would be sufficient both for rural and urban districts if they were properly framed and applied. There were many drawbacks in applying one code of by-laws to a rural district and another to an urban district. In the first place districts were constantly changing, and it was quite conceivable that a man who resided in an urban district might yet desire to build a country cottage, in which case he would suffer from all the irksome regulations of the urban district, notwithstanding that he was building a rural cottage. He thought that a code of by-laws might be framed to apply automatically to the many different kinds of buildings and districts. That was rather an important point. As to the many defects of the by-laws, one did not quite know where to begin and where to end. There were certain risks that did not, as a rule, vary in districts—such as fire risks, for instance—yet they saw in one district all sorts of regulations as to carrying party-walls through roofs, which did not

exist at all in other districts. A fire was just as likely to break out in one suburb as in another; in the North of England as in the South; and it was easy to realise that if a party-wall was necessary to be taken through the roof in one case, surely it was in another. His principal point was the desirability of one code of by-laws instead of several, and rather than attempt to divide the country up into rural and urban districts, to discriminate between buildings.

Mr. W. H. ATKIN BERRY [*F.*] said that while considering the defects of the existing by-laws he hoped that in any effort which might be made to obtain a more reasonable code they would not overlook another point, which he thought was a very important factor in the difficulties and troubles they had to encounter—viz. the standing and qualifications of the officials who were responsible for the administration of those by-laws. He had come to the conclusion that a great deal of the difficulty and trouble which architects experienced in by-laws emanated from the arbitrary and entirely ignorant attitude of some of the officials called surveyors. They were in many cases men of no training whatever—sometimes scarcely more than promoted road foremen, yet those men were accepted by municipal bodies as competent authorities to advise them in dealing with the architect's plan and the client's interest, and they practically had the whole matter under their thumb. It seemed to him most important that, while pressing for an improved and more reasonable code of by-laws, they should insist on a better class of man to administer them.

Mr. J. DOUGLASS MATHEWS [*F.*] said that it was a very strange thing, to his mind, that within the London area a building was exempt at a certain distance from the road or from any other building, and yet in the rural by-laws no notice whatever was taken of the amount of land around the building. Surely if in London an open space of 30 feet round the house was sufficient to exempt a building from the Act, the same thing might apply to the country; and if there was a row of half a dozen cottages it would not be a serious matter if there were some kind of exemption. If something of that kind were to be adopted in rural districts it would save a great deal of the trouble now experienced. Attention might certainly be called to that matter. With regard to what the previous speaker had said about officials, he thought that officials administering the by-laws should understand that their business was to induce building and to make things as easy as possible, instead of throwing impediments in the way of those who wished to erect dwellings.

Mr. G. A. T. MIDDLETON [*A.*] asked if Mr. Ridge would take as an addendum to his resolution the following words: "and, if possible, to produce uniform by-laws for urban and rural districts."

It had been pointed out that there were such things as contiguous rural and urban districts, and that the relaxed conditions in the rural district would draw a large population from the urban district; and he assumed that before very long the rural district would in fact become an urban district, and would come under what were properly urban district conditions. How was that to be got over unless there was one uniform set of by-laws which automatically applied by means of the air space round the buildings?

Mr. C. H. BRÖDIE [F.] said that they were all at one with Mr. Ridge in hoping that a real practical outcome would result from this discussion. How that was to be brought about he did not see except—by slightly altering the maxim—that “hard cases make good law.” They could certainly show a series of very hard cases which should help them to secure the abolition of the present by-laws in so far as they were arbitrary and interfered with what the best people in the kingdom were striving to obtain, that is to say, buildings for the people who could not pay extravagant rents. One of the chief reasons which would induce him personally to urge the Local Government Board to withdraw the present by-laws was the action of the various authorities in preventing a man from even commencing his building until the plans were passed. He was not altogether sure how that point arose. Some by-laws expressly stated that the building should not be commenced until the plans were passed. Other by-laws had not that clause; yet the authorities would not allow the building to be commenced until they had approved the plans. That acted very hardly in many cases, because those bodies sometimes met only once a month, and if by accident or from any other cause the plans were not in by a certain date, the building could not be commenced for a month. Such a regulation was absurd, as the authority had always the power to come in and stop the work at any moment if the building did not comply with the by-laws. The regulation was very oppressive in another way also; to his own knowledge the authorities refused to pass the plans, although they might be in perfect accord with the by-laws, because they were not in accord with the fad of some official or of certain members of that particular authority. For instance, he knew of a case in which an ash-pit was required to be built. The reason for this requirement became evident at a later stage of the proceedings when the local authority required that a special means of emptying the ash-pit should be provided, and after that they proceeded to flaunt in the architect's face the by-law which said that that special means of emptying the ash-pit should be 13 feet wide at the least, and if the way to clear this ash-pit was more than 100 yards long that passage way should be 16 feet wide. But that was not the end of it; they afterwards proceeded

to argue that that land ceased to be the individual property of each house, and therefore you had to go back an extra distance from the fence, which was nearer to the house on the side of that 16-foot road. So that the by-law which said that a certain area had to be provided was forced up to mean that a certain area plus the width of the 16-foot-wide road had to be provided at the back of the house. And so on *ad infinitum*. The persons concerned in this particular case were desirous of going on with the building, but a question arose immediately: “You cannot go on with the building; the Council will summon you before the magistrates, because you begin without having your plans passed; you have no case. What is your answer to that? You are bound to be fined.” The result was that a block of nine large shops had never been erected to this day, and the rates of that district were suffering to that extent. That was an absolutely illegal requirement. This particular case was so hard that he (Mr. Brodie) had made inquiries in the neighbourhood as to the experience of other people, and he had received a letter from an architect—a member of the Institute—from which it appeared that it had taken him five months to get his plans passed by that particular authority! Cases like that properly placed before the Local Government Board should help them very much to obtain the end that the meeting had in view.

Mr. GEORGE HUBBARD, F.S.A. [F.], said there was a general impression that it was impossible to begin the building until the plans had been passed by the local authority, but he was rather doubtful whether that was so in fact. The wording was that plans had to be submitted; there was nothing in the by-laws which required the building owner to get his plans passed before he could commence operations.

Mr. LACY RIDGE asked if the word was not “deposited.”

Mr. HUBBARD: It might be “deposited,” but there was nothing about having the plans passed. However, if the building were begun before the plans had been passed, it would be begun at the building owner's own risk. If he built in accordance with the requirements of the local authority they could not stop the work; if, however, he happened to make the unfortunate mistake that his client had made when building a billiard-room in front of the building line,* then the consequences were rather serious.

Mr. BERTRAM BULMER [F.], in support of Mr. Hubbard's point of view, said that he was acquainted with a case where plans for a block of semi-detached villas were submitted to a borough council, and they declined to pass them. The architect took up the position that they complied in every particular with the by-laws, and he went

* JOURNAL R.I.B.A. 24th Dec. 1904, p. 133.

on with the work. Those semi-detached villas were erected and were standing there to this day.

THE PRESIDENT asked if Mr. Brodie would tell them the wording of the particular by-law in the case he had referred to.

MR. BRODIE said that, so far as he could see, there was nothing in those by-laws which would prevent anyone commencing to build immediately he chose. But his clients were advised by their solicitors that if they began to build the authority would summon them, and if they were summoned they would have no answer. There was another peculiar thing in the same case. One drain took the drainage of four houses, and the authority required him to make that drain 9 inches. He thought a mistake had been made in typing the letter, and on inquiry he was informed that it was not intended to be 6 inches, and it must be 9; and if it was not 9, the plans would not be passed. This happened in the borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, and he hoped that borough would take his remarks very seriously to heart, because such actions as he had referred to might account for the fact that Surbiton was growing enormously, and that Kingston, so far as appearances and his information went, was a-dying, and perhaps almost a dead town.

MR. LACY RIDGE [*F.*] said that with respect to the Local Government Board they need not be at all alarmed; they knew all about it; they had had this business most effectually rubbed into them. The architects were not the only people who had been at them; in fact, comparatively speaking, as a body, architects had been rather lethargic in the matter. The only hope of getting better surveyors was to get bigger districts. There was no reason why a town of 5,000 or 6,000 inhabitants should be separated from the adjoining district. It was not a crowded place; it was not urban in the sense of wanting the kind of regulations that were wanted in London; and it would be very much better if the town and rural district went in together, and all had rural by-laws. That would to a great extent get over the difficulty of the country changing in character, which it did, of course, very gradually. His outlined by-laws were to a certain extent intended to meet the transition. With regard to not going on with buildings until the plans were approved, it was all very well to do anything irregular in this way, but it must be remembered they were not doing it on their own responsibility or at their own risk. The client had the annoyance of it; the client had the risk of it; and the client was very liable to think his architect was a fool if he got him into a row with the local authority!

THE PRESIDENT then put the motion—viz. "That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is desirable that the Local Government Board should obtain parliamentary powers to enable them to reform the by-laws now in force in rural districts

and in the smaller towns with a view to the enactment of such by-laws, and such by-laws only, as are really required in the public interest."

The motion was carried unanimously.

Architectural Design and the London Building Act.

The meeting then proceeded to the discussion of Mr. Gibson's Paper.*

MR. WILLIAM WOODWARD [*A.*] said that, although Mr. Gibson's Paper was somewhat on the lines of Mr. Lacy Ridge's, it affected a very much larger and a very much deeper interest, inasmuch as it affected the Metropolis. Mr. Gibson had given some very useful and interesting information as to the width of streets in various Continental cities as compared with the width of streets in London; but Mr. Gibson had omitted to mention Portland Place, with its width from building to building of 120 feet, which struck everybody as being of a magnificent width, but principally because of the comparative lowness of the buildings. Northumberland Avenue is 90 feet wide, and when one remembered Mr. John Gibson's building which was first erected in that avenue they all thought that that width was sufficient; but when the hotels and the clubs were built the 90-foot width appeared to reduce itself to very much less. It therefore followed, as Mr. Gibson had so properly urged, that it was not so much a question of the width of the street as of the height of the buildings which fronted that street. With regard to the Unter den Linden and the Champs Elysées, they must not be much affected with the width given there, because the width from building to building hardly formed an important part of the effect created when one looked through those avenues. On the matter of the percentage of area for a brick-and-mortar town, New York was a very important example. Architects in practice in London were constantly pulled up, and their difficulties were materially increased by the particular lines laid down by the Building Act of 1894 as regarded the open spaces connected with buildings. Mr. Lacy Ridge in his Paper had given an area for all buildings, and one could disregard the position of that area; and if public health was to be considered, so long as there was an uninterrupted area for light and air and ventilation, he ventured to say that that area should be considered, not so much with regard to its exact position in reference to the building as to the extent of the area of bricks and mortar upon the land. They would find then that very many difficulties which the Building Act of 1894 enforced would at once cease. Therefore he thought that Mr. Gibson's suggestion—which, as he understood, was the rule in New York—that there should be a percentage of open area with regard to building sites of the bricks

* "Architectural Design and the London Building Act."—JOURNAL R.I.B.A., 24th December, p. 124.

and mortar upon those sites was a very important one for consideration, especially in view of the fact that there was looming in the distance a Building Act Amendment Bill. He was only sorry that Mr. Gibson's Paper had not been deferred a little longer, so that they might have had the pleasure of discussing in connection with it certain provisions of that marvellous Building Bill which was to be introduced by the London County Council. Mr. Gibson said that we had allowed the shopkeepers to determine the character of our street frontages. That was a subject they had often had before them. He had heard eminent architects say that it was monstrous that buildings should be erected in London which apparently stood upon plate glass, and that there should be large piers which apparently supported that which they did not support, and so on. He had, however, often put this query to himself: Supposing one of their big London drapers came to one of their most distinguished and most eminent architects, a member of the Royal Institute, and asked him to erect a building upon which he was going to spend £200,000, and that he wanted on the front of that building as much glass as possible. He wanted the building carried safely, but no pier in the front must exceed 2 feet 6 inches. Supposing he put it to him in this way: "If you will undertake to give me this, you shall be my architect. If you will not—if you carry out the traditions of the Royal Institute and will have your arches and your massive piers—I shall go to another architect." He had often wondered what would be the answer! He had spoken rather feelingly on this point, because he happened to be one of those unhappy individuals who had to conform sometimes to the requirements of tradesmen, and he could only say that to the extent of his ability he did provide all the piers and all the support he could possibly get out of his client. When he had done this, and provided a 2 ft. 6 in., or a 2 ft. 9 in., pier, then his client would ask if he couldn't take another 9 inches off! It was a very difficult problem. Mr. Gibson had made some reference to the use of steel work in buildings being recognised. When the Act of 1894 was passed the employment of steel in London was not so prevalent as it is now. The great object of architects in using steel was to reduce the thickness of walls. If they could employ steel and get rid of some of the thickness under the schedule of the Building Act of 1894, of course they could with equal strength provide very much thinner walls, which would be a very important factor in erecting a commercial building. With reference to public bodies who should be subject to the operation of Parts VI. and VII. of the Building Act—especially railway companies—he remembered saying at the Surveyors' Institution in discussing the Bill of 1894 that no body whatever should be exempt from the operation of the Act. There was

no reason whatever why railway companies should be permitted to erect such execrable buildings as they did, in total defiance of an Act with which other people had to comply. He would make every public body, even the Office of Works, although Mr. Gibson exempted them, subject to those particular sections of the Act [A Member: "The London County Council?"] Yes, the London County Council also, who were the very first, in a case of Drury Lane, to do that which was wrong as regards their own Act. With regard to another important point raised by Mr. Gibson, as to district surveyors being practising architects, those who remembered the days of twenty-five, thirty, or thirty-five years ago would know that most district surveyors then were practising architects. He remembered perfectly well that their difficulties were then got over; they were helped and assisted in every way, because the gentlemen who then had to superintend the works were practising architects; they knew all the difficulties and all the trials connected with building in London; and without any derogation whatever from their public capacity and from their public duty, and without any detriment whatever to the public interest, in consequence, and only in consequence, of their being practising architects, they were able to assist the architect in getting his building satisfactorily completed, and thoroughly in accordance with all the healthful requirements of any particular Act. He hoped the Institute would insist, so far as it could, with reference to the new Act, that the district surveyors should, as far as possible, be practising architects. They had to contend with district surveyors who had had no practice whatever, who had had no experience of the difficulties in erecting buildings in London; they found them applying the Act of 1894 with all the narrow-mindedness and with all the faddism which permeated every ill-informed official in this country. He sincerely hoped the Institute would do its best to secure that district surveyors in future should not be so much under the thumb of Spring Gardens, but that they should be independent gentlemen, able to administer the Act, and able to assist, to the best of their ability, in the works which architects had to carry out. The following paragraph in Mr. Gibson's Paper was deserving of much thought on the part of everybody who desired improvement in the municipal control of this country: "Nothing can be more inimical to the interests of the public, to the growth of architecture, to the beautifying of our streets, than to have as interpreters and administrators of a complex Building Act persons who, although highly skilled in technical knowledge and masters of routine, are inexperienced in the erection of buildings." If Mr. Gibson could only prevent that, the Institute and all practising architects in London would have every reason to be grateful to him; and not only the architects, but

their clients themselves would have every reason to say, "We have a municipal body in London thoroughly alive to the healthful interests of its inhabitants, thoroughly alive to the architectural beauties of the Metropolis, but also thoroughly alive to the fact that it is not to the interest of anybody—it is not to the interest of the architect or of his employer—that they should be, as they are now, governed to a very large extent by red tape."

Mr. BERNARD DICKSEE [F.] said that as a district surveyor perhaps he might be allowed to say a few words. Concerning the question of open space in the rear of buildings he had always felt that the Act of 1894 was totally inadequate to provide the necessary open space, for the very good reason that it provided it in the wrong place; the Act required an open space at the rear of the building, of the full width of the building, and not less than 10 feet from front to back. There were, however, many buildings, many hundreds of them in his district, where there was not a single window lighted from that open space. He was referring particularly to the class of small buildings put up largely for the working classes: they were built with a front and back room and a rather long back addition. That open space at the rear of the building was no use at all, and to provide it the back additions of adjacent buildings were frequently crowded closer together, so making the open space between, intended to light the windows, of very little use. The Science Committee drew up some very good suggestions as to the open space. Those suggestions were based to a certain extent upon the New York provisions and to a certain extent upon the Philadelphia provisions, that is to say, that there should be an open space equivalent to a certain fractional area (whatever might be decided), of the whole site, that open space to be disposed in such manner as to afford sufficient means of light and air to the various windows. That would leave it open to the district surveyor to assert, if he thought so, that that space did not provide sufficient means of light and air; the matter would go before the magistrate, as it did now, and the district surveyor would have to prove his case. The main principle was that the open space should be elastic, not so much in size perhaps as in position. As regarded steel construction the Institute had sent up a very good set of suggestions to the County Council for the new Bill. The County Council in their wisdom—or otherwise—did not propose to insert these in the Bill at all, but they proposed to take to themselves the power to make regulations for steel construction. Not by-laws, it was to be noted, but regulations. If they were by-laws they would be subject to the provisions of the Act of 1894 for the construction of by-laws; that is to say, they would have to come to the Institute and to half a dozen other bodies, and to be finally approved by the Local Government Board after

hearing any objections that might be lodged against them. But by using the word "regulations" in this new Bill, all that machinery would be set aside with a high hand; and these regulations, if made, would be made by the London County Council off their own bat, and they would have to carry them out as best they could. Some would have to build under them, and others would have the burden of trying to enforce them. That was a point to which the Institute should pay particular attention. He was afraid they were to a certain extent to blame, because the Institute tacked on to the end of their suggestions a suggestion that it would be better to have these in the form of by-laws, so that they might, if necessary, be altered without the necessity of an Act of Parliament. His view was that they should take form in the Act, even if there were power given to the County Council, with certain restrictions, to amend certain portions if amendments were found necessary. To turn to Mr. Woodward's attack on the district surveyors, he was sorry to say that in some cases there was some truth in his complaint. His own view was that the district surveyor was not intended to obstruct building, but to assist it. There were certain regulations to carry out, and to that extent his hands were tied; he could not help himself in many cases. But there were different ways of carrying out the Act, and if the district surveyor could show the architect that the Act could be complied with and the architect's views met at the same time, he was morally bound to adopt that course. As a district surveyor he wished heartily to endorse Mr. Woodward's and Mr. Gibson's suggestion, that the Institute should insist, to the utmost of its power, that the district surveyor should be a practising architect. He (the speaker) had given up his practice when he became a district surveyor, and he was bound to admit that being without practice had not assisted him in his work. He was obliged to do all he could to keep himself abreast of the times. If the Institute did not move very considerably at this present time matters would go from bad to worse. The London County Council made a mistake twelve or fourteen years ago in making candidates sign this condition engaging not to practise. The new Bill contained provisions that would entirely destroy the independence of the district surveyor. They proposed in the first place to exempt all their own buildings, and so remove any control that the district surveyor might have over them. They proposed to take to themselves power to alter the district surveyor's title to anything they thought fit; they proposed to abolish the safeguard that he had at the present moment that, if they did elect to pay him a salary, that salary should not be less than seven years' average fees; and they proposed to reserve to themselves the right to take action, in lieu of the district surveyor, so that they might

walk over their heads—in fact, the district surveyors would be at the end of a string from Spring Gardens. He sincerely hoped that the Institute would do the best it could for the district surveyors in this case, and in doing the best it could for the district surveyors he was sure it would be doing the best it could for itself and for the public. It was of the utmost importance that the District Surveyor should be entirely independent of Spring Gardens, and therefore capable of carrying out his duties without fear or favour. They were not at the present moment quite, what Mr. Woodward said, under the thumb of Spring Gardens—they were not officers of the Council; but, if this Bill passed, he was afraid they would be, and then the law in London would be carried out in very much the same way as the law in the rest of the country was carried out. The proper solution of the difficulty was to assimilate the country law to the London law, and not the London law to the country law. Another point he should like to touch upon—viz. the importance of the provision of the frontage line in respect to architectural effect. Nothing could be more deadly dull than a uniform level line of frontage. The present Building Act dealt only with the general line of buildings, not with the frontage, what was known as the building line, at all. It had been held in the Courts that the present law only applied to the existing line of existing buildings. Those decisions were *Barlow v. Kensington Vestry*, in the House of Lords; the *London County Council v. Cross*, in the Appeal Court; and *Allen v. the London County Council*, also in the Appeal Court. In all those cases it was laid down that the line mentioned in section 22 of the London Building Act must be an existing line to existing buildings, and in the House of Lords, in the *Barlow v. Kensington Vestry* case, it was decided that the line did not extend beyond the last building. That, however, had not been the practice of recent years. The practice adopted very largely at Spring Gardens, and by some district surveyors, was that that line extended right along the street (according to those decisions it did not), and if that line extended all along the street they arrived at this absurdity. He did not know how many buildings would constitute a general line of building, but he should imagine three. If three would necessitate the conclusion that a street was commenced, he should imagine three would necessitate a general line of building. Imagine the case of a new street in which the building owner could, if he thought fit, build close up to the footway. He elected to set back, say, 20 feet, to put bays standing out about five feet. When he had put up three houses, the district surveyor or the County Council would say, "You have set up a building line. You must continue that line right through, and you cannot put up any more bays projecting 5 feet, because you are not allowed to put them more

than 8 feet in advance of the general line of building." If that was the case, the man, in order to get his bays, must set back 2 feet more, and when he had another three houses he had set up another building line; and so on all the way down the street. Thus there would be receding series of three houses all down the street. It had often occurred to him that the Institute might do some good in trying to introduce into future legislation some provision for the building frontage, as distinct from the general line of building as now existing. He was thinking particularly of those blocks of buildings such as they saw round the parks, and in large numbers in the city of Bath, where there was a projecting centre and two projecting wings. As the law in London was at present interpreted, if it was proposed to put up such a block, the builder must start with the two ends and the centre block, or it could not be put up at all; because, if he started with a projecting block at one end of, say, two houses, and then had five houses in a wing, set back 5 feet, when he came to the central block he would be stopped; and if he got beyond the central block he would be blocked again at the other end, and have a one-eyed block of buildings. If the property owner were entitled to build throughout the whole of that site right up the street, why should he be stopped from building anywhere behind that line? His suggestion was that anyone who proposed to build a block of buildings of that or any other description should be entitled to bring to the district surveyor a block plan of what he proposed to do, and, having deposited it with the district surveyor, he should be entitled to carry out that scheme; and no arbitrary idea of a building line, or general line of building, should compel him to cut off his corner block. Perhaps in this new Bill, if the Institute could, they would see their way to get some such provision as that inserted. It was of the highest importance; for there was no point in the Act that had a greater bearing on architecture than the frontage line.

Mr. EDWIN T. HALL [F.] said that the subject Mr. Gibson had brought forward was of the very greatest interest, because of what they all knew was in the air, the new Bill which the London County Council were about to submit to Parliament. He hoped the Practice Committee would exercise the greatest vigilance in watching and studying the new Bill as soon as it was in draft. Judging from the synopsis of the Bill, most radical changes were to be proposed in building—changes which would accentuate the difficulties they had already to contend with. Before dealing with Mr. Gibson's Paper, he should like to draw attention to one radical change proposed in the new Bill—viz. that of the constitution of the Tribunal of Appeal. It was proposed that the architectural member of that tribunal should not under any circumstances be an architect prac-

tising in London; he might be a doctrinaire or literary architect, or he might be a gentleman practising in Liverpool, or Glasgow, or Edinburgh, but he must not be practising in London. He could not imagine any more inconvenient and troublesome provision than that would be in the administration of an Act of Parliament for the Metropolis, which was a province equal to some ten or a dozen of the largest cities of the kingdom. Coming to Mr. Gibson's Paper, while alive to the very great advantage of open spaces which would result from increasing the width of streets, they must be careful in enacting the minimum width of a street that they did not go from the frying-pan into the fire. One of the provisions of the new Bill was that no one should build within 35 feet of the centre, instead of 20 feet as now. In the synopsis there was no suggestion at present that anybody was to be compensated for the sacrifice. Imagine what it meant! With reference, however, to Mr. Gibson's suggestions, he thoroughly agreed with him that there should be an increase in the width of streets. Even in the near suburbs of London there should be a minimum width of 60 feet for main streets and main cross-streets—that is to say, streets which were, or were likely to become, great thoroughfares either from east to west, or north to south, and across bridges; and it would be greatly to the benefit of the suburbs in laying out new estates if the other roads were to be 50 feet instead of 40. That was not an unreasonable requirement. Personally, when he had laid out estates near London he had made his roads 50 feet; and he thought this width would be wiser in the interests of those laying out estates, even though it might curtail the ground-rents to be derived from the property taken as a whole. Beyond that they should not go. Mr. Gibson, he thought, suggested that there should be a 70-foot road, or something of that sort; but it must be remembered that if a road was made of an excessive width (and for a suburban street that was an excessive width) it meant, among other things, an immense capital outlay and an immense maintenance charge per annum to keep it up, for which the rates paid. If a street were unnecessarily wide it was a wasteful development. A road 50 feet wide was a good wind channel, and it admitted plenty of sunshine for the houses on both sides. It must not be forgotten that if they made wide streets, they must make havens for the pedestrian traffic. In London itself there should be power—with proper compensation to owners—to make main streets up to 100 feet in width. Beyond that such powers should not be given. Mr. Gibson, he believed, went even so far as to say that there should be a general re-alignment of streets in London. That was a counsel of perfection; but had he realised what it would cost to convert any main street in London to that width? Take Cheapside: he should, he thought, be quite within

the mark in saying that it would take one hundred million pounds to widen Cheapside alone. They must be practical; it was no good for the Institute to make suggestions which were impracticable. They could not lay before the ratepayers any suggestion for a compulsory re-alignment which would involve London in a cost perhaps equal to the National Debt. With reference to heights, a suggestion was made that the heights were to vary with the widths of the frontages; but if the suggestion were that the height of streets was to be in relation to the widths of the frontage, the result would be higgledy-piggledy. There were buildings in places which had only 10 or 15 feet frontage, and say that those buildings were allowed to be 20 feet high, was it suggested that with a frontage four times that width, they would go four times that height? Where would be their broad treatment of architecture?

Mr. JAMES S. GIBSON said that that was not quite the point. The point was that under the present Act each owner of a building was allowed to erect and design the front of his building to his own ideas; that is to say, there was no continuity of design as between adjoining owners. If under the new Act a greater height than 80 feet to the wall-head were allowed, as obtaining an architectural uniformity, in narrow frontages there should be power given to enable continuous owners to collaborate with a design. Two 15-foot frontages could join together.

Mr. HALL: There was nothing to prevent that now. Any adjoining owners could do that, and constantly did it. No Act of Parliament is required to enable two men to agree. With respect to the height of buildings, though he agreed with increasing the width of streets, he did not think that the limit of the present Building Act was an unreasonable one for a city like London, where not only property was of great value, but the necessity of being within a given area was paramount amongst men of business. When it was remembered that New York permitted of buildings of 100 and 150 feet in height, why should they stand aghast and talk about their height being an unreasonable one? It was reasonable, having regard to what London is. With reference to railway companies, he thought the public ought to make a strong protest against their being exempt from the operation of the Building Acts. Their railway stations, with one or two exceptions, were a disgrace to London. Take, for example, Victoria Station, which was at present being rebuilt. For years and years the company who owned that station had paid a dividend of 10 per cent., giving to foreign visitors the most deplorable idea of the architecture of London on their first arrival here. What more miserable building could one see? Compare it with some of the foreign stations; compare it with the Frankfort-on-Maine Station, the like of which we did not possess in this kingdom. It cost, he believed, one

million and a half English money to build, and was a fine architectural composition. It had nineteen parallel platforms, and an ante-platform between the booking-office and the gates, 100 feet at least in width, and on that ante-platform they could put probably five battalions of soldiers. The station was replete with every luxury and comfort. Arriving there one could not only refresh the inner man, but could have a bath and a dressing room. Why could they not impose upon the railway companies here an obligation that they should build respectable stations for the credit of the city? It should be compulsory upon them also to be amenable at all events to the Building Acts. With reference to the great difficulty of glass frontages, Mr. Woodward, he was afraid, had posed them all. If any one of them were offered such a building as that he mentioned, he did not think they would have the courage to decline it. But he thoroughly agreed with what the President had said in his opening Address. Some years ago he (Mr. Hall) put up a block of buildings in the City, and he insisted on putting large piers which he hoped were architecturally better than the glass. But the occupants of the building surrounded these piers with plate glass and show-cases, so that the piers did not show at all! But he had seen worse things in other cities. In Glasgow he had seen one building with the front all glass, and in Frankfort, again, he remembered a large place with a frontage of 60 or 80 feet that was glass from top to bottom; there was not a bit of wall in the whole frontage. Therefore, though it was very shocking, they were not the only wicked people in respect of that. With reference to the architectural treatment of streets, there again a great difficulty occurred. They would all like to see their streets noble in design; to see them vistas of beautiful architecture; but they must not forget that England had been probably made by its individualism. It was owing to that quality which had made England so great that the individual man wished to have a say in his individual capacity and in the carrying out of his building. They had to consider the genius of the people when they wished to make the streets as they are in Paris—every house alike, or every house part of one general scheme of design. That could be done under an autocratic Government perhaps; but with the individualistic Englishman Parliament would find great difficulty in passing a regulation insisting upon it. In conclusion, he should like to express the wish that the Institute would impress upon the Practice Committee the necessity of watching this new Bill, and would, if necessary, strengthen their hands. It was a Bill of the most drastic character.

Mr. WILLIAM WOODWARD [A.], referring to the clause in the Amendment Bill as to the constitution of the tribunal of appeal, said that representations had been made to the Parliamentary Committee as to the advisability of withdrawing that

clause; but the Committee, it appeared, intended to insist upon it; so they might guess what the London County Council meant as regards frontage.

Mr. E. W. HUDSON [A.], speaking as to the height of buildings, said they had had a good many adverse remarks with regard to the drastic requirements of the London County Council; but he thought they were indebted to them in this respect, especially in new thoroughfares where they had limited the height of buildings. At any rate they had not allowed an American syndicate to have such a long lease of frontages in the Strand or Kingsway as would have enabled them to put up those monstrosities which were the bogy of every true architect. Nothing would have been more deplorable than to have structures like Somerset House and the churches adjacent dwarfed, crushed, and crowded by such structures as were to be seen on entering New York Port. With regard to open spaces being required between instead of behind small property, that was a very difficult matter to alter. In such neighbourhoods as Mr. Dicksee had spoken of, a great portion of the accommodation of the house or flat was given in the back additions; and he failed to see how a large space for air and light could be provided between them in narrow plots. Therefore they must accept the lesser of two evils, and be content to have the space at the rear, because it benefited the adjoining houses also which gave on to it. The only thing they could do was to prevent the windows in one back addition staring right into those of another, which in some places was the case. He should like to add his testimony to the help that they obtained even now from the district surveyors. Forty years ago things, however, were different, and architects were not looked after so sharply as they are now. They must sympathise with the district surveyors, knowing what risks they ran if they made a mistake or overlooked anything for which they might be pulled up at Spring Gardens. He did not know whether it would be possible for them to attend to the increased duties in connection with building in London if they were allowed to practise privately. In old times he believed one gentleman could not practise in his own district, but he got a brother district surveyor to father his buildings, and he did the same in turn in the adjoining district. Whatever was said as to the demand for commercial structures whose lower frontage was plate glass, he was sure all would strive to get a reasonable amount of pier, even if it were of steel actually in evidence.

Mr. C. H. BRODIE [F.] said he should like to break a lance in favour of the exemption of some great corporations from the provisions of the Building Acts. Mr. Gibson objected to these corporations being exempted, but at the same time he had put in a very strong plea for the use of reinforced concrete. Had it not been for the exemption of these great corporations from the

provisions of the Building Acts, reinforced concrete would be an unknown material within the county of London. It was only the railway companies who were exempt from the provisions of the Building Act which had been able to afford us the sight of a building constructed entirely in reinforced concrete.

Mr. JAMES S. GIBSON [F.] thanked the meeting for the reception accorded to his Paper. He had prefaced it with the remark that it was concerned only with the artistic view of the Building Act; that is to say, he had taken up only those portions of the Act with which they as architects, having some sympathy with architecture as an art, were chiefly concerned. He dealt with construction only in so far as it had a direct bearing upon the artistic effect, and the effect of artistic designs of buildings. His object in reading the Paper was twofold. In the first place, he wished to point out, so far as he could, all those portions of the Act of 1894 which in his view were not conducive to the artistic development of architecture, so that in any action the Institute might take (and he hoped it would take strong action) those defects might be remedied in any future enactment. Mr. Woodward had referred to the fine width of Portland Place, 120 feet, and the comparatively narrow width, in relation to the height of the buildings, of Northumberland Avenue, with its 90 feet lined on each side with very high buildings. This emphasised one of his most important points—viz. the widths of streets were relative to the heights of buildings. Within a radius of a mile and a half of St. Paul's Cathedral—that is, within the business centre of London—it was desirable that the owners of property should be allowed to erect buildings to a greater height, relatively to the width of streets, than they should be allowed at a greater distance than a mile and a half. He divided the city into three zones: one, a mile and a half radius from St. Paul's, which would be three miles across, and within that area buildings could be erected of a greater height than the width of the street, all having a direct ratio, beginning with the narrow streets 40 feet in width, and going up to a width of 100 feet. Within the area of the business centre of London streets of 100 feet in width were necessary, and the direct evidence of that was in Kingsway. The new street, which the County Council had taken all this time to cut through the old congested area, was 100 feet wide, and that itself was a proof that streets 100 feet wide were necessary within the commercial centre of London. If streets were made 100 feet wide within the commercial centre of London, in his view it was right and proper that buildings higher than the widths of these streets should be permitted. The maximum height he advised was 125 feet. Outside this area came an area of another mile and a half—that is, a radius of three miles from St. Paul's Cathedral—and within this area the build-

ings should not be allowed, under any circumstances, to be higher than the width of the streets. Outside that area again, beyond three miles from St. Paul's, no buildings should be as high as the width of the street. The result would be that more aëration would be secured the farther one got from the centre; and future difficulties of acquiring property to widen streets would be very greatly lessened, because we should not have buildings so congested as they are under the present Act. It appeared to him that the chief defect of the whole Act was that one regulation was made which it was fondly imagined would apply to all circumstances. As to the question of the realignment of the main traffic lines within the commercial centre of London, there was not the slightest doubt that, whatever it cost, it would have to be done. At the present time the difficulty of dealing with public improvements was that there was no scheme or method upon which those improvements were undertaken. They would chop off a bit at the corner of Cheapside because a few buses stopped there every morning; they would chop off a little bit on the south side of Piccadilly, and set back the frontage line about 6 feet; and so they would go on chopping off little bits; but they would never apparently have any scheme to deal with the traffic. Whatever those improvements might cost, the cost to the community now was immeasurably greater than any capital cost which it would take to work out the whole realignment of the commercial centre of London. With respect to steel construction and reinforced concrete, they were questions which it was in the very nature of things necessary for the County Council to deal with. Steel construction was known, and used largely, and great experience was obtained in the use of it, in America practically, long before the time of the passing of the 1894 Act; but it was apparently necessary to have enormous fires in Baltimore to bring it home to the officials at Spring Gardens that steel construction, properly applied, was a safe and sound form of building construction. The County Council made no provision for any other form of construction than that of buildings of bricks and stone and similar materials, which might be perfectly satisfactory, and were perfectly satisfactory; no provision was made for advancement, or for taking advantage of any new materials that might be discovered or used. His point in regard to steel construction was that its adoption altered the whole complexion of the regulations of the Act dealing with the relative areas of solids and voids. That was the whole point he wished to make. If they admitted for a moment that it was possible safely, so far as the public were concerned, to construct a building of steel and concrete, they immediately changed the whole character of the relative areas of points of support. Ritz's Hotel in Piccadilly was practically a steel building, yet it must be cased round with granite and stone and

brick carried on steel girders—weighting those girders for no purpose whatever—simply to comply with the Building Act which only provided for a brick wall. Any county council, or any other authority, which had the public interest at heart, ought not to be allowed to continue to enforce by-laws of that nature, which were practically obsolete. The strongest point upon which the Institute, as an institute, should concentrate its efforts, when it came to deal with the proposed amendments of the Building Act, was that point of retaining the services of district surveyors who were practising architects, and to do everything they possibly could to lessen red tape and mere officialism. If they did that, they would go a long way towards getting better architecture, and more freedom to work, and the public would not suffer at all.

THE PRESIDENT said that at that late hour he would refrain from making any remarks on the points which had been raised, though he was much tempted to do so. He was greatly in sympathy with much that Mr. Gibson had put before them. There was one matter, in connection with his point as to the three zones, which he wished to draw attention to, viz. the overcrowding in the suburbs, which was increasing to an alarming extent. The extension of the tramway system was causing the owners of small properties, houses with perhaps five or six acres, to move further away, and the ground was at once caught up by the speculative builder and covered with as many houses as he could cram on to it. That was a crying evil, and something should be done to regulate the amount of building in the suburbs—for the farther away from the inner zone the wider the spaces should be and the lower the houses, so that there might be as much air drawn towards the centre as possible. They had had a number of very valuable suggestions, and he hoped that they would come before the Practice Committee and be of assistance to them in placing the matter before the proper authorities.

MR. DOUGLASS MATHEWS said that a Committee was sitting at the present moment to consider amendments, and the Council would take steps to bring all the suggestions made that evening before the County Council. The Committee would take good care that they were urged at the proper time.

Building By-laws in the South African Colonies.

MR. CRAWFORD LINDSAY, A.M.I.C.E., writes:—

I venture to express great sympathy with the objects of the meeting held under the auspices of the Institute with reference to a reformation of by-laws controlling building operations in rural districts and small towns.

I have lately been engaged for a period of twelve years in the Colonies of Natal and South Rhodesia as a municipal engineer; for ten years I was as-

sistant borough engineer at Durban, Natal; and two years as town engineer at Salisbury, South Rhodesia. During that time I have had to approve of many hundreds of building plans, and at first realised the difficulties of architects and builders where they were delayed in commencing operations until plans were passed by the Building Committees. When delays inconvenienced builders &c. in Durban, we gave the building inspector and chairman of the Building Committee special power to give authority to commence, subject to the approval of the Building Committee, which passed plans *one day per week*. As these meetings were conducted weekly, it was not often necessary to exercise these special sanctioning powers. In Salisbury, of course, the conditions were those of a small English town so far as building operations were concerned, and there we found that the interests of the town could be amply safeguarded by leaving the approval of plans which were in conformity with the by-laws in the hands of the town engineer and one member of the Council. In cases where I thought it advisable, I referred the plans to the "whole Council Committee," but that did not often occur.

I think it would be inadvisable to allow buildings to be commenced without sanction, even if for no other reason than that it encouraged people to evade the by-laws; and the building inspector should be most particular about conditions of sub-soil and foundations, as well as damp-courses. I think professional men too often forget that very many plans are submitted by ignorant builders and amateurs, and the regulations apply to all. In the Colonies of South Africa our building by-laws are based upon *improved* English practice.

Caversham Schools Competition.

The following correspondence has passed between the Secretary of the Institute and the Oxford Education Authority:—

31st December 1904.

DEAR SIR,—

Caversham Schools Competition.

I am directed to draw the attention of the County of Oxford Education Committee to the conditions of this competition, and most earnestly to urge a revision in the following particulars:—

The amount of work entailed in submitting the competition designs is far too great; much of it is unnecessary, the assessor not requiring such elaborate drawings whereon to base his decision. Clause 4 (iii) could be considerably simplified.

Clause 10 would naturally be found unsatisfactory by any competitor. I am to urge your Committee to guarantee that the author of the first premiated design shall be employed to carry out the work, provided there is no valid reason to the contrary.

The commission of 5 per cent. should only cover

the services stated in the Schedule of Professional Charges issued by the Institute, a copy of which I enclose. If it includes travelling and out-of-pocket expenses, attendance before Local Government Board inquiries, and the copies of plans as laid down in the penultimate section of clause 14, it is difficult to see how an architect of repute could make the work remunerative. In any case he would obtain very inadequate payment for his services.

The section of clause 14 relating to all measurements, bills and accounts being handed over to the Committee might with advantage be omitted from the conditions.

I am directed most respectfully to lay stress on the advisability of the conditions being modified, as the competition could not fail to be disappointing if conducted under the conditions as at present drafted.—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully.

W. J. LOCKE, *Secretary.*

The Clerk, Education Committee, Oxford.

[REPLY.]

5th January 1905.

DEAR SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 31st, and to tell you that up to the present time the following modification has been made: "that a detailed specification separated under the several branches of the building trade need not be sent," and that competing architects have been informed accordingly.—Yours truly,

S. STALLARD.

W. J. Locke, Esq.

If this is all the modification that the Committee intend to make in the conditions, it would be well for members of the Institute to refrain from competing.

French Schools of Art.

The deputation from the Glasgow School of Art, consisting of the chairman, Mr. James Fleming, with two others of the Governors, Mr. W. Forrest Salmon [F.] and Mr. John J. Burnet, A.R.S.A. [F.], and the headmaster, Mr. F. H. Newbery, appointed to visit and report upon the working of some of the more important of the national and municipal schools of art in France, have just issued their report in pamphlet form.

In Paris the deputation visited (1) the Ecole Nationale et Spéciale des Beaux-Arts; (2) the Ecole Nationale des Arts Décoratifs; and (3) the Palais du Trocadéro. Introductions to the various institutions were obtained through the French Ambassador in London, M. Cambon.

The Ecole des Beaux-Arts is directly controlled from the Ministry of Public Instruction of the Fine Arts. The teaching administration is vested in a director and the body of professors known as the Superior Council. This institution is practically the university of art, not only for

France (although the educational facilities there afforded are primarily for Frenchmen), but for the whole world. All nationalities are represented on the roll of students. Male and female students are alike eligible for admission. Instruction throughout is free, and there is no registration fee. No students above twenty-five years of age are admitted. Entrance examinations are held twice yearly, and are very exacting. Should the admission work gain acceptance, other proofs follow to be executed before the candidate is permitted to be enrolled. Architect candidates have to submit to a test of their powers of design, and have further to execute a work in drawing from the antique and ornament; modelling; calculations and logarithms; arithmetic; algebra and elementary geometry; descriptive geometry applied to architecture; descriptive geometry; oral proofs of history knowledge, and a written composition. M. Henri Mayeux, architect, gives an annual course of lectures on the decorative arts to students of the school. There are three ateliers for painting, three for modelling, and three for architecture. Each atelier receives visits from a professor three times weekly. The teaching comprises courses of study, exercises set by the professors, examinations, and competitions. There are eighteen distinct courses of study, and the programme for these courses is determined by the Superior Council of the school and approved of by the Minister. The whole system of teaching and study is based upon examinations for awards, competitions for prizes, and the submission of specified work for prizes and bursaries. All judgments are made by juries special to each section of school work. The juries are chosen by the professors among themselves. The architectural school is divided into first and second courses. A diploma of architecture is granted to students who successfully complete the work of these two courses. In connection with the school there are:—(1) A museum of casts (all styles and periods); (2) a museum of copies of pictures of the Old Masters; (3) works that have obtained the Prix de Rome; (4) a collection of works that have obtained medals; (5) material for study of anatomy, geometry, stereotomy, physics, chemistry, and construction; (6) objects of art given or bequeathed to the school; (7) library.

The Ecole Nationale des Arts Décoratifs, in the Rue de l'Ecole de Médecine, is a school for the application of fine arts to industry. The institution is housed in a building formerly a school belonging to a religious order. Its classes are open day and evening. Students under thirteen are not admitted to the day classes, nor under fourteen to the evening courses. Candidates for admission submit either a study of ornament in light and shade, a modelled study, or an exercise in architecture, according as they wish to be enrolled in either one of the courses of drawing, modelling, or architecture. Should any one of these proofs be

considered worthy, the candidate is admitted at once to the superior division of the course. Any student admitted into one particular section can at the same time attend two other sections, as room permits. All instruction is free. The subjects taken are drawing, modelling, geometry, plant study, architecture, mathematics, ornament and architectural composition, history of art, perspective, and anatomy. There are special studios for ornament applied to industry (painted and modelled), as also a special atelier for architecture.

Other schools visited and reported upon were the Ecole Nationale des Beaux-Arts at Lyons; the Ecole Nationale des Arts Industriels at Roubaix; and the Ecole Municipale des Beaux-Arts at Lille.

In France education is free, but no student may enter a school of art until he has passed an entrance examination. This examination demands preparatory instruction, which is provided for in special preparatory schools. The entrance examination is such that candidates applying must exhibit both skill and earnest endeavour in order to obtain a pass. The ordinary French student is compelled to follow a definite and rigorous course of training.

The gratuitous instruction that everywhere prevails may partly account for the organisation and methods to be found in the French schools. The French people take art and art instruction much more seriously, says the report, than is the case in Scotland.

The deputation feel they have gained an experience of work and methods which should be of great service to the Glasgow School of Art. It is hoped that by the aid of the continuation classes of the School Board and by the establishment at some early date of a preparatory school the thorough preparation of students for the Glasgow School of Art may be assured. The accommodation for work afforded by the Glasgow School of Art compares favourably in many respects with that existing in the French schools. The general excellence of the work of the Glasgow School of Art in drawing and painting will, the report states, bear comparison with that produced by the Continental schools; but in architecture, advanced designs, and figure composition there remains much to be accomplished in Glasgow.

Alexander Thomson Memorial Studentship.

This Studentship, value £60, competed for triennially, is open to architectural students between the ages of 18 and 25 years, residing in the United Kingdom, and qualified as described in the Deed of Trust. The Studentship is awarded for the best set of Drawings submitted in accordance with the subjoined programme. There is a further prize of £20 for the set placed second, should the number of the competitors and the quality of the work submitted warrant an additional prize being given.

The subjects for the 1905 competition are:—

I.—A Study of a Classic Building. Carefully drawn and detailed, preferably with shadows projected. If specially prepared for this competition, the subject to be the Monument of Lysicrates, drawn in elevation, showing four columns, with necessary sections, and with shadows projected in monochrome or colour, to a scale of half-inch to the foot; details to be half full size. A suggestive Restoration is given in D'Espouy.

II.—Design for a Cascade and Portico in a Public Park. Situated on a rocky and wooded slope that has a gradient of one in eight, and falls towards the south. There is a stream of water fifteen feet wide that may be dammed and distributed to suit the composition. The Cascade will form the centre piece, and will be flanked by Porticoes that may terminate in Pavilions. The whole composition shall not exceed 300 feet in breadth, by 250 feet in depth. The formal lay-out of the Garden, with Terraces, Stairs, Bridge, &c., to be shown; and within the conditions given, the disposition of the parts is left at the discretion of the Competitor.

The Drawings required are:—(a) A General Plan, scale $\frac{1}{8}$ inch = 1 foot; (b) Plan, Elevation, and Section, scale $\frac{1}{4}$ inch = 1 foot; (c) Detail of a Part, scale $\frac{1}{2}$ inch = 1 foot; (d) Perspective Sketch. All on sheets 40 x 27 inches. A, B, and C, to be drawn in ink, and may be tinted. The shadows to be projected at an angle of 45 degrees. The perspective may be rendered in any medium. Besides these the Competitor must submit:—(a) Drawing from the round, shaded. (b) At least two sheets of Architectural Sketches, preferably not executed specially for this Competition.

The last day for sending in drawings is the 28th December 1905. The successful competitor is required to go on a sketching tour for three months, in order to pursue his architectural studies. The competitor placed second, should this prize also be awarded, is required to spend a period of three weeks in making drawings from the reproductions from Classical Buildings in the British Museum London, or elsewhere, as may be arranged to the satisfaction of the Trustees.

The Trustees of the Studentship are the Council of the Glasgow Institute of Architects, and full particulars may be obtained from the secretary, Mr. C. J. MacLean, 115, St. Vincent Street, Glasgow.

The late Arthur Edward Perkins [F].

Mr. A. E. Perkins, whose demise took place on the 23rd December 1904 after a long illness, was the son of the late Mr. Arthur Perkins, of Worcester, the architect under whose direction the general restoration of Worcester Cathedral was carried out. The elder Perkins was a pupil of the late Mr. Thomas Rickman, the well-known architectural author. Mr. A. E. Perkins was educated at Mr. King's school at Worcester. On leaving school he entered the office of the late Sir Gilbert Scott, R.A., where he remained for some years. Afterwards he was with Mr. T. G. Jackson, R.A., as assistant, for fourteen years. In later years he had a small private practice, chiefly in domestic work. He was elected a Fellow of the Institute in 1904. Mr. Perkins was well known in his pro-

fession as a perspective artist, in pencil, ink, and water-colour. Many of his drawings of buildings by various architects have been hung at the Royal Academy, and have been reproduced in the professional journals. His happy disposition and genial manners made him many friends by whom he will be much missed. He leaves a widow and two children.

S. P. REES [A.].

NOTES, QUERIES, AND REPLIES.

The Architects' Law Reports (Illustrated).

From Mr. ARTHUR CROW [F.]—

Referring to Mr. Langton Cole's appreciative notice of the first volume of this publication in the JOURNAL of the 24th ult., may I be allowed to say that, so far as practicable, the suggestions he makes for future numbers will be adopted?

Beginning with No. 6, the proposal to add a few blank pages for press cuttings, memoranda, &c., has been embodied in the second edition of Vol. I., which is now in the press.

With regard to Nos. 2 and 3 there is no reason why the name of the "winning party" should not be added where there is any ambiguity in the matter; but the publication of the amount of the taxed costs, if ascertainable, would not be pleasant reading to either party, and might be resented.

The size of the pages was only decided upon after very mature consideration. A reduction in the width of the margins would spoil the appearance of the work, which is now uniform with the R.I.B.A. JOURNAL. Moreover, the "Accumulating Index" in its present form would be impossible, as it already encroaches considerably on both margins. It is hoped that the present size of page will allow of additions being made to these subject indexes for at least five years, when they will be transferred *en bloc* to a quinquennial digest. The illustrations, which, so far as can be gathered, will form one of the most attractive and useful features, could not be produced to a proper scale in a smaller work.

In this connection an expression of opinion would be welcomed as to whether "art paper" should continue to be used for the body of the work or only for the illustrations, an unglazed paper being substituted for the letterpress.

The introductory matter, which Mr. Langton Cole thinks should be excluded, is not intended to be bound up, as will be seen by the paging; but in the writer's opinion a work which merely records judicial decisions, however useful, does not go far enough. The authoritative ruling as to the interpretation to be placed upon a particular enactment frequently shows that the law has failed in its purpose, or is unjust, inequitable, or unduly irritating and irksome in its operation, and that it needs amendment.

Surely no more suitable place can be found for the consideration of such matters than in a journal where the decision is recorded. The present intention therefore is to invite architects and others to contribute articles on such important questions as the means of escape from buildings in case of fire, the height of buildings in relation to the width of roads, the provision of air spaces about buildings, the reasonable modification of building enactments in rural districts, and other subjects of general interest to the profession. By this means it is hoped to increase the usefulness of the work and, with a more extended circulation, to reduce the price of the quarterly parts to half-a-crown.

The Great Baltimore Fire.

From Mr. R. LANGTON COLE [F.]—

May I call the attention of members to the Report on this fire which has been issued by the British Fire Prevention Committee? It is well worthy of careful study, and seems to bring out, broadly speaking, the following points:—

1. The importance of preventing the access of fire horizontally, *i.e.* through ordinary windows.
2. The desirability of making all fittings as non-inflammable as possible.
3. The value of concrete as a protection to steel-work, and the unsuitability of terra-cotta.
4. The superiority of good bricks over all other fire-resisting materials.
5. The value of sprinklers, internal and external.

The Report is well illustrated, and has an excellent map, and can be consulted in the Library of the Institute.

THE ARCHITECT'S RELATION TO THE BEAUTIFUL.

A Letter to an ex-Pupil who failed to pass in Design in the recent Final Examination.

22, Fawcett Street, Sunderland: 27th Dec. 1904.

DEAR MR. —,— You made some remarks in a recent letter, which I think I did not find time to reply to, on the mental process of design as you yourself practise it.

I think with you that no rule can be laid down. Each man must take his own way, and the same man will not always take the same way.

Designs themselves differ widely as to their conditions and requirements. In most the practical is of paramount importance, and the æsthetic is quite a subordinate consideration. But in some few cases the æsthetic overrides the utilitarian. The Queen Victoria Memorial in St. James's Park, by Sir Aston Webb, is a design of this last exceptional type.

To my own sentiment no commission could

B B

be more sickening than to be called on to design a construction for purely ornamental purposes. I should find small pleasure in designing an *Arc de Triomphe*. It seems to me an essentially inane object. But if it were made not merely *that*, but to serve some definite use beside, as, for example, to carry an aqueduct, or canal, or viaduct, or as the gateway of a fortified city, or even as a landmark, the sickeningness of the task would disappear, some excuse, however lame, being found to justify it.

The monuments of antiquity are often sublime memorials of the stupidity of their builders. If the ancient architects had understood how to make iron pipes they would never have gone to the enormous expense of aqueducts in most cases where those mighty works were done; and had they been so far advanced in the chemistry of explosives as the moderns, their picturesque city walls and castles would never have frowned on mankind.

The province of architecture is, however, not purely materialistic, but it is called to minister to man's spiritual as well as material needs.

The truest poet is he who invests with spiritual charm the common life of men; and they are rightly grateful to him. Thus the Scotch appreciate highly what Sir Walter Scott did for their land, and still more what Burns did for their peasantry. The Galloway people owe an immense debt to Stevenson and Crockett. The folks of Kirriemuir can never repay Barrie for services rendered by his writings; and the modern Presbyterian Church owes to Ian Maclaren no less an obligation than the English Church owes to Kingsley and others. Thomas Hardy has made the Dorsetshire commons classic, and Baring Gould has done for the Devonshire moors and the Essex broads the same inestimable turn.

The mediæval architects made the cruel, hard Norman rule beautiful by its castles and cathedrals. It was their province to meet the practical needs of their time, and to invest all their efforts with the subtle influence of art. Their gargoyles were more than mere water nozzles; their windows were more than mere apertures for light; their groined roofs were more than mere weather-excluders. And had they been called to design a coastguard station some of the dreaminess of their natures would have found expression somehow; and the product, while fulfilling all the actual needs, would have had a spiritual expression too.

The intense practicality of our day tends more and more to swamp the dream nature, so that we modern architects neglect it. Like Martha, we are "anxious about many things." The old-world architects were more sentimental—more like Mary—they had chosen the "better part," the spiritual side of their calling.

Reverting now to the question you raise as to methods of design, I would put it to you that it is

a question of how to find room for the spirit of art to live and breathe among piles of brick-and-mortar. The question, I think, really is this: Which shall reign, the *brick and mortar* or the *soul*? A good deal depends on the way in which the architect proceeds to answer that.

In my judgment it is a bad thing for an architect at the outset of his designing to aim at too immediate definiteness.

Let him use a fine soft pencil and play with it, making lines so faint he can barely see them. The soul and fancy can thus be wooed to enter in when hard, definite, precise beginnings would scare them right away.

The best artistic productions are evolved from the world of the intangible. The more tangible you make your design the less æsthetic it is. Hence the outside of even a cathedral in broad daylight loses of poetry what it gains of actuality.

If thou wouldst view fair Melrose aright,
Go visit it by the pale moonlight.

A great principle of artistic evolution is that *beauty must be developed from its source, and must not be separated from either its source or destination*. It must be suggestive, without absolute beginning or ending, being related to the infinite, the spiritual, the mystical.

However earnestly resolved the *planner* may be to meet all practical needs, he should have, underlying that motive, the secret spring of yearning for the beautiful. Combinations, proportions, perspective effects, and æsthetic properties generally, should lie, as warm rich soil, at the root of all his practical work, and send up its juices through the dry crust of uses in every possible way.

There is such a thing as architectural Pharisaism, consisting in the minute attention to practical details, to the utter neglect of æsthetic opportunities.

And I can well imagine the great Master Builder saying to such sticklers for constructional propriety, and sanitary quips and cranks, "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

The "weightier matter" of architectural law and order is, after all, *the spirit of grace and fitness*.

You know me well enough as a practical architect and engineer, to exonerate me from any crazy, impractical, ultra-Ruskinesque sentimentalism, too childish and silly to commend itself to an age like ours, an age of Titans.

But you would mistake me utterly if you thought my insistence on a perfect knowledge of the science of construction—which I may call the *anatomy* of architecture—was intended to be emphasised at the expense of the spiritual element of our vocation.

You unfortunately fell into that error in making the practical arrangements of your coastguard station perfect, and letting the æsthetic element go hang.

I fear some of my advice to you on this subject before your examination came off may have been partly to blame for this error, though I did not mean it so.

Under the earth's crust there is a substratum of fire and water which leaps forth to light in exceptional volcanoes and frequent springs. So beneath the cold exterior of the architect's practical mind there should always be an immense reserve of artistic energy, seldom if ever obtruding itself in extravagant manifestations, but animating and refreshing all his designs.

Take, for instance, a problem on which my mind is just now being bent, viz. the construction of cheap artisans' dwellings. The prose is patent and palpable at first blush—too grossly so. If that prose element were allowed to absorb all the mental domain, I should produce a hideous row of miners' huts and hovels.

But I find my mind dwelling on rusticated fronts cast sectionally in concrete, on projecting bay windows under broad eaves with their shade and effect of snugness and comfort, on chimney-stacks picturesquely breaking the sky-line, on contrasts of solid and void, on surface and texture and colours of materials in agreeable contrast, on a general effect of brightness, piquancy, daintiness, ruralness, invitingness, *homeliness*; and at the same time my common sense assures me if these qualities can be implicated in a *cheap* cottage they will popularise it, and create a demand for similar houses, and make the builder's enterprise *commercially* succeed.

If my clients were like some I could mention, and if I were to name to them the artistic considerations which thus underlie my plans, they would take fright and say: "Confound your art fads! give us what we want—shelter for these *human pigs* at the lowest rate you can!"

But I don't pin my architectural heart on my sleeve. My best motives are my own private concern, while I take good care not to neglect the sanitation, comfort, and convenience of the people I am catering for.

Restaurateur Meng's famous wedding cakes have their ingredients skilfully compounded to tickle the palate (the grosser nature), while externally they are made of artistic forms pleasing to the less gross visual organs of sense.

The Yankee name for an architect, "house artist," is right. It hits the nail right on the head. Your Yank knows what he is talking about when he invents names and insists on calling spades "spades." Utilitarianism prevails in Yankeeeland. But the æstheticism of human nature, like original sin and like murder itself, will out. Hence the demand for "house artists" who know not only and care not only to construct the architectural skeleton of steel or timber, but who clothe it with its covering of marble, granite, stone, or shingle, as the opportunity affords, and produce

effects at once *fit* and *charming*. I loathe the conception of an architectural designer as a mere ornamentalist. Presence of abundant ornamentation, as you know, may coexist with vulgarity, and the absence of ornamentation may characterise designs of exquisite taste and charm.

The tailor-made dress of a lady, with its severe lines and dainty cut, combining comfort and fitness with a high sense of the beautiful, will illustrate my conception of what we architects should aim at.

Proportion, propriety, good taste, can make themselves felt like a good conscience. In these respects the good architect infuses his feeling into all he does. His plans are *plots* for the introduction of the beautiful into common life. From the very outset he is beset with practically imperative lower considerations, which he too often suffers to take all the go out of him. He too frequently submits to become the mere tool of these practical orders, instead of *plotting* to make them subserve his higher artistic motive.

Now I think I have said enough, and that if I had said half as much before you made that ghastly coastguard station front, you would have made an effort, without increasing cost, to express a feeling of picturesque refinement in your *tout ensemble* which would have "caught on."

You will shine all the better next time, I trust.

I shall be glad to learn what other subjects (if any) you are relegated in.

Had I been an examiner, though I should not have admired your elevational effort (!), I, knowing you could do much better, should certainly not have relegated you in design for that unfortunate surrender of your soul to ugly prose.

Yours faithfully,

FRANK CAWS.

ALLIED SOCIETIES.

THE MANCHESTER SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.

Architecture at the Victoria University, Manchester.

Responding to the toast of the Victoria University of Manchester, at the Annual Dinner of the Manchester Society of Architects on the 16th ult., Vice-Chancellor Hopkinson, K.C., said he had been delighted with the work that had been accomplished as a result of the establishment of the Chair of Architecture at Victoria University. It was attended by a number of earnest students, and was working without any friction amongst the various other branches there. He congratulated the Manchester Society of Architects, and singled out for special mention the efforts of their President (Mr. J. W. Beaumont) and the Hon. Secretary (Mr. Paul Ogden) for the way in which they had supported the movement, and so enabled the younger

members of the profession to obtain the best possible education. Their action he characterised as unselfish and high in its ideals. He could not help thinking that the working together of the profession and the University was an indication that they were recognising what lay at the root of all real artistic progress in affording opportunities to those who were engaged in theoretical pursuits to bring their studies to some practical result. He went on to remark that he did not think it was impossible to have great artistic productions in Manchester, and referred to the numerous fine buildings that already existed in the city. He was glad that they recognised that by the profession and the University working together there was a future for English architecture. He looked hopefully to the future of the Chair of Architecture as a result of the union of those who were engaged in theoretical study, the study of letters and the study of history, and the closer connection between those who were engaged in the Universities and those who cared for the highest ideals and advance of their profession.

GLASGOW INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

The Council of the Glasgow Institute of Architects have addressed the following letter to members of their Institute:—

115, Vincent Street, Glasgow: 22nd December 1904.

DEAR SIR,—The Council of the Institute has had under consideration the apparently increasing prevalence of valuable presents being given on the occasion of the laying of foundation-stones or formal opening of buildings by the architects concerned to those officiating, and even, in some cases, to their wives or relatives.

In such circumstances, and where the importance of the building warrants it, the presentation of a trowel or key by the contractors is often expected, and the action of the architect in co-operating in such cases, either financially or by designing and selecting the article, as also in representing those concerned at the presentation, is in no way criticised by the Council.

Anything beyond this, however, is considered objectionable, as setting up between architect and client a wrong relationship of donor and recipient, and as unfair to many of the profession in encouraging rivalry as to the importance and value of the respective gifts.

Such, after due consideration, being the unanimous feeling of the Council, it has been thought desirable to place these views before the members of the Institute generally, and to ask their co-

operation in discouraging the practice referred to, the Council being assured that members will not only recognise the validity of its objections, but welcome its support in this matter.

In name and on behalf of the Glasgow Institute of Architects.

C. J. MACLEAN, *Secretary*.

MINUTES. V.

At the Fifth General Meeting (Business and Ordinary) of the Session 1904-05, held Monday, 9th January 1905, at 8 p.m.—Present: Mr. John Belcher, A.R.A., *President*, in the Chair, 26 Fellows (including 10 members of the Council), 30 Associates, and visitors—the Minutes of the Meeting held 19th December 1904 [*ante*, p. 144] were taken as read and signed as correct.

The following members, attending for the first time since their election, were formally admitted by the President, viz.:—Bernard John Dicksee, Percy Burnell Tubbs, and Llewellyn Kitchen (Hull), *Fellows*; William Edward Arthur Brown, Charles Michael Childs, Norman Culley (Huddersfield), William Thomas Curtis, John Malcolm Dossor (Hull), Percival William Hawkins, and Charles Ernest Monro (Glasgow), *Associates*.

The Hon. Secretary announced the decease of the following members:—Arthur Edward Perkins, *Fellow*, elected January 1904; John Thomas Wimperis, *Fellow*, elected 1877; Arthur Charles Wissenden, *Associate*, elected 1883.

The Hon. Secretary called attention to a number of works recently presented to the Library [see *Supplement*], and a cordial vote of thanks was passed to the donors.

The following candidates were elected to Fellowship by show of hands under By-law 9:—

CHARLES HENRY BRODIE [A.J.]

GEORGE ALFRED HUMPHREYS, A.R.C.A., Llandudno, North Wales.

WILLIAM THOMAS LOCKWOOD, Chester.

ALFRED EVERY POWLES, Northwich.

ERNEST RICHARD ECKETT SUTTON, Nottingham.

Discussion of the Paper read at the last meeting by Mr. Lacy W. Ridge [F.] on BUILDING BY-LAWS, SPECIALLY IN RURAL DISTRICTS was resumed, and on the motion of Mr. Lacy W. Ridge [F.], seconded by Mr. Edwin T. Hall [F.], it was unanimously

RESOLVED, That in the opinion of this Meeting it is desirable that the Local Government Board should obtain Parliamentary powers to enable it to reform the By-laws now in force in rural districts and in the smaller towns, with a view to the enactment of such By-laws, and such By-laws only, as are really required in the public interest.

The Meeting then proceeded to the discussion of the Paper read at the last Meeting by Mr. James S. Gibson [F.] on ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN AND THE LONDON BUILDING ACT; and various proposals for the amendment of the present Act having been discussed, Mr. J. Douglass Mathews [F.] on behalf of the Practice Standing Committee undertook to bring them forward when the amended Bill came before the Committee for consideration.

The proceedings then closed, and the Meeting separated at 10 p.m.

